Edwin L. Goodrich, Grain Valley, Mo., in place of R. J. Fine, resigned.
Christian A. Greminger, Sainte Genevieve, Mo., in place of P. A. Baechle, retired.
Dorian M. Alexander, Shelbyville, Mo., in place of H. H. Forman, deceased.

MONTANA

Elsie P. Garbe, Pablo, Mont., in place of F. L. Stimson, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Marlene M. Leger, West Swanzey, N.H., in place of F. G. Naromore, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Alfonso W. Magurno, Bloomingdale, N.J., in place of L. A. Harby, removed.
John G. Hurley, Hackettstown, N.J., in place of J. G. Stout, retired.
Norman H. Levbarg, Lakewood, N.J., in place of W. H. Applegate, deceased.
Wilson G. Bell, Normandy Beach, N.J., in place of W. L. Kessler, resigned.

NEW YORK

Jessie Bradley, Barryville, N.Y., in place of Eva Purcell, retired.
Ruth I. Robl, Black River, N.Y., in place of W. R. Holt, retired.
Helen C. Miller, Cadyville, N.Y., in place of H. N. Cataracte, retired.
Walter A. Kanas, East Moriches, N.Y., in place of A. E. Olson, retired.
Sidney Schorr, Far Rockaway, N.Y., in place of C. P. Buonora, deceased.
Walter E. Fitzgerald, Getzville, N.Y., in place of W. G. Clare, deceased.
Evelyn M. Cassara, Highland Lake, N.Y., in place of Jeanette Bye, retired.
Glenn W. Sickles, Mumford, N.Y., in place of F. T. Callan, deceased.
Gerald M. McGinnis, Norwood, N.Y., in place of G. G. McQuaid, deceased.
Clarence R. Ford, Saint Bonaventure, N.Y., in place of C. T. Glackin, deceased.
Walter S. Eckel, Schodack Landing, N.Y., in place of M. P. Van de Wal, retired.
Lavina M. Kubler, South Cairo, N.Y., in place of R. C. McLaren, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Thelma J. Johnson, Ferguson, N.C., in place of J. C. West, retired.
James H. Ross, Lincolnton, N.C., in place of V. N. Fair, retired.

OHIO

Henry L. Hanson, Chesterland, Ohio, in place of G. R. Evans, retired.
Norman G. Betz, Duncan Falls, Ohio, in place of H. F. Laub, retired.
Eugene O. Place, Leipsic, Ohio, in place of R. W. Wortman, deceased.
Harry R. Smith, Paulding, Ohio, in place of E. E. Hardesty, retired.
Philip E. Foster, Winchester, Ohio, in place of J. R. Short, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Doyle V. Strong, Beaver, Okla., in place of D. D. Fry, deceased.
Dorthy J. Orton, Fort Towson, Okla., in place of E. E. Meggs, deceased.
Charlie D. Payne, Lawton, Okla., in place of Bennie Stephens, retired.
Leta M. Brock, Mannsville, Okla., in place of D. A. Stilley, deceased.
James T. Hughston, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

OREGON

Bernice B. Muller, Wolf Creek, Oreg., in place of B. M. Hopper, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Herman E. Schwirian, Buena Vista, Pa., in place of G. V. Lacey, resigned.
Margery B. Lehman, Duke Center, Pa., in place of C. F. Semelsberger, deceased.
Nicholas C. Nachman, East Springfield, Pa., in place of M. G. Spencer, retired.
James L. Yingling, Gibsonia, Pa., in place of J. A. Moore, deceased.
Carl F. Englehart, Hunlock Creek, Pa., in place of S. C. Croop, deceased.
John W. Weller, James Creek, Pa., in place of F. J. Garner, retired.
George A. Ciprich, Laceyville, Pa., in place of A. C. O'Mara, retired.
William E. Noland, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of E. A. Deming, retired.
Charles E. Wise, Lebanon, Pa., in place of D. E. Walter, removed.
Chester W. Marburger, Mars, Pa., in place of J. M. Mattern, retired.
John W. Cooner, Millheim, Pa., in place of W. J. McMullin, retired.
George W. Lauck, Jr., Pine Grove Mills, Pa., in place of G. W. Lauck, retired.
Kathleen W. Cairns, Morgan, Pa., in place of C. M. Viola, resigned.
Verla J. Hill, Needmore Pa., in place of M. M. Waltz, retired.
Francis J. Augostine, New Castle, Pa., in place of W. R. Hanna, deceased.
William H. Jones, Ralston, Pa., in place of J. M. Dougherty, retired.
Michael Conrad, Jr., Worthington, Pa., in place of R. H. Weaver, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry Summerall, Aiken, S.C., in place of B. R. Permenter, retired.
Ruby G. Hodge, Alcolu, S.C., in place of N.E. Hodge, retired.
Joseph G. Orvin, Manning, S.C., in place of J J. Ropp, retired.
Clara M. Mason, Varnville, S.C., in place of L. P. Ginn, retired.

TENNESSEE

Juanita J. Waller, Baxter, Tenn., in place of W. V. Cole. retired.
Frederick C. James, Jr., Gadsden, Tenn., in place of M. J. Cox, retired.
Woodrow W. Parker, Jasper, Tenn., in place of W. W. Turner, retired.

TEXAS

Charles D. Brown, Bremond, Tex., in place of A. H. Clark, retired.
Marion E. Summers, Dripping Springs, Tex., in place of M. L. Spaw, retired.
Sadie B. Davis, Elgin, Tex., in place of E. N. Sowell, retired.
Eddie G. Rinehart, Franklin, Tex., in place of R. B. Truett, retired.
Arthur W. Faubion, Leander, Tex., in place of D. R. Sherman, transferred.
T. C. Wilhite, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.

UTAH

Ray M. Wettstein, Woods Cross, Utah, in place of N. M. Ballard, retired.

VERMONT

James R. Hudson, East Montpelier, Vt., in place of J. P. Dudley, deceased.
Stanley R. Beauregard, Saint Albans, Vt., in place of H. G. Kennedy, retired.
Paul W. Rivait, Salisbury, Vt., in place of J. E. Petersen, retired.
Herman W. Mercier, Swanton, Vt., in place of I. E. Bronson, retired.

VIRGINIA

Clarence M. Vassar, Charlotte Court House, Va., in place of W. H. Smith, Jr., retired.
Byron A. Pepper, Colonial Beach, Va., in place of J. M. Mason, retired

WASHINGTON

Lavern M. Deane, Anacortes, Wash., in place of G. N. Dalstead, retired.
Lynn I. Sauve, Moxee City, Wash., in place of G. S. Cartier, retired.
George C. Hale, Saint John, Wash., in place of M. S. Falk, retired.
Vada P. McMullan, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert A. Underwood, Ellenboro, W. Va., in place of O. L. Curry, retired.
Billy J. Blankenship, Itmann, W. Va., in place of V. B. Coleman, retired.
Thomas E. Roberts, Keystone, W. Va., in place of F. A. Webb, transferred.
Lanelle W. Michael, Sinks Grove, W. Va., in place of L. R. Lemons, retired.

WISCONSIN

John M. Stauffacher, Darlington, Wis., in place of W. R. McCarville, transferred.
John Weinberg, Gleason, Wis., in place of E. E. Welch, retired.
Fredean P. Miller, Powers Lake, Wis., in place of Carl Pretzman, retired.
Jerome M. Kowaleski, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of E. C. Jones, transferred.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commanders

Pentti A. Stark
Merlyn E. Natto
Alfred C. Holmes

To be lieutenants

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Charles K. Paul
Dee E. Kimbell

To be ensigns

James H. Allred
Gordon E. Mills
Paul W. Larsen
Michael Gemperle
Leland L. Reinke
Christian Andreasen
Robert T. Coffin
Henry L. Pittock III
Ronald W. Elonen
John B. Jones
Thomas E. Ryder
Edgar N. Vail

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amos 5: 24: *Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, may our President, our Speaker, and our Members of Congress know how to steer the ship of state during these days, through perilous waters and guide it into those channels which lead to peace and prosperity.

Give them wisdom to consider every piece of legislation with fairness and frankness, judging it conscientiously and prayerfully and then express themselves, as statesmen, with a voice and a vote that manifests candor and freedom.

May the day speedily come in our Republic when all our citizens shall be free and capable of thinking independently for themselves and not be dominated by prejudice and expediency or by popular opinion or movement of any party and parties, but when our Government shall truly be "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 851. An act to amend the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to also market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3872) entitled "An act to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLARK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATOR OF GSA TO PROVIDE FOR PURCHASE, ETC., OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 432, Rept. No. 539), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REPEAL OF SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 2388 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. THORNBERRY, on behalf of Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 433, Rept. No. 540), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4897) to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE NAVY AND THE LATEST BATHING SUITS

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed by an illustrated article which appears in the Saturday Evening Post of July 13 to July 20, 1963. The headline is "Trim New Swimsuits for Summer Maneuvers—An Exclusive Preview of the Bathing Outfits Soon To Hit the Beaches Shows Midriffs in Exposed Positions While the Bikini Achieves a Strategic Advance and Fabrics Make Critics Wonder if the Suits Are Really Immersible." Then followed large colored pictures—one is entitled "Lycra Suit by Roxanne Receives Tank Test and Attention from Seabees of a Navy Amphibious Construction Battalion." A model is pictured with nine Seabees. Next is a full-page picture entitled "Making Practice Landing, Camp Pendleton Marines Engulf Models in Avant-Garde Suits." Here we see our marines, in full battle dress, pictured with several models. Another picture bears the title: "Members of Navy's Underwater Demolition Unit I, Training in San Diego, Clamber up Coronado Rocks Among Sunbathers Wearing Vinyl Suits." Models in the new swimsuits are shown with the demolition team.

A full and accurate explanation is due us by the Secretary of the Navy and all those responsible for permitting such photos to be taken and published. In my estimation, this article is an unfair reflection on all our fighting men in all the services and they must resent it. That our marines, in battle dress, are pictured in such a frolicking manner is a disgrace to our Marine Corps, long admired and respected for their bravery in battle, as well as to every man serving in the Navy.

What an image of decadence this article creates. Is this the kind of service we are asking of our men and permitting them to perform? What, then, is the need for calling young men to service, interrupting their education and working careers? What of the wives who are compelled to face all the problems of rearing young children alone while their husbands are away performing their military obligations?

If there can be some reasonable excuse for this shambles, I should like to hear it. And I maintain that no matter how plausible an explanation is given us, the whole impression is so bad and tragic from a psychological standpoint, that the entire episode is unforgivable.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL APPRENTICESHIP BILL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a Federal apprenticeship bill to prohibit discrimination in apprenticeship, on-the-job training, upgrading, and other joint labor-management training programs.

The bill covers labor organizations, employers, and certain other hiring and training organizations.

It sets up an Apprenticeship Training Commission composed of five salaried commissioners to be appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis.

Jurisdiction of the States having effective antidiscrimination laws is preserved. The Commission would have the power to utilize regional, State, and local agencies to accomplish its purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the need for such legislation is clear. The best available estimates indicate that only 2 percent of those undergoing apprentice training in the United States are Negro; and that out of a Negro work force of some 7 million—11 to 20 percent are unemployed—twice that of other workers.

Apprentice training in all its aspects covers well over one-half million jobs a year. Where discrimination exists in this area it prejudices American society from the home to the school and wastes some of our best human resources.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on June 4, I joined in introducing the Equal Rights Act of 1963 to enable individuals and the Federal Government to initiate civil cases to enforce 14th amendment guarantees in the use of public facilities; and to enable the Attorney General to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals by initiating civil injunctive actions on their behalf.

It is my hope that the Congress will enact this additional legislation introduced today as the right—on merit—to

seek gainful employment that is basic to our concept of democracy. The denial of this right to join a union or to participate in joint labor-management training programs hurts the individual, the family, and the community.

McCORMACK PARK

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I walked to the office through the area bounded by Independence Avenue and C Street. This is the area from which the buildings were recently removed. The cellars have been filled in and the open spaces have been graded and seeded and are now covered with a pleasant growth of fresh, green grass. A remarkable number of trees have been preserved and stand in full foliage. Birds flit from tree to tree and fill the air with pleasant song. Altogether, this is a peaceful and verdant oasis in the midst of the brick and concrete of Capitol Hill.

I have never been clear as to the reason for the acquisition of this property. Speaker Rayburn indicated that it would be used for an addition to the Library of Congress. Others have proposed its use as a memorial to James Madison, but there appears to be no clear-cut decision or policy in this regard.

By spending a small amount of money, this area could be made into a pleasant park which would provide a much needed area of recreation and repose in the midst of the legislative hurly-burly of the Hill. A few more trees could be planted, some shrubbery installed, paths constructed, and benches set about at convenient intervals. A Roman-style fountain could be installed so that the musical splash of its water could provide a note of refreshment in the warm summer weather.

I regretted losing the rows of historic houses which were demolished in the course of this reconstruction, but it may be that we have acquired a more satisfying natural asset if we have the good sense to preserve it.

Since this park should have a name, I suggest that it be named in honor of the present Speaker of the House. We now have the Cannon, Longworth, and Rayburn Office Buildings.

Why not McCormack Park?

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I placed at the desk for the first time as a Member of the House a discharge petition to bring before the House my resolution, House Resolution 407, that would provide a rule to debate and act upon House Joint Resolution 9, to amend the Constitution to offset the Supreme Court decision to permit prayer in public schools and all public places on a voluntary, nondenominational basis. The petition is before the House. We need 218 signatures.

I call your attention to the wonderful action of the great and honored Speaker of the House in having placed above his dais the words "In God we trust." And he does place his trust in Almighty God. I always did respect our great Speaker, but this action on his part even increased my respect for him.

Not only should we amend the Constitution to offset the two cases the Supreme Court has already decided, but these cases now under preparation, one to remove "In God we trust" from our currency and another to take "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance.

As I said before, the urgency of this matter leaves me with no alternative but to file this petition. I know many Members, like myself, have never signed a discharge petition. I have never signed one for material things, or for material benefits. This discharge petition deals with our belief in Almighty God and our right to preserve it. I believe our faith in Almighty God is the foundation of our country. If we do not take action and sign this discharge petition, I think we are doing a disservice to our religion and our free society. I urge you to sign this petition now as rapidly as possible in order to bring this matter before the House.

I also stated in a personal letter to all my colleagues in the House, that:

> The urgency of this matter leaves me no alternative, if, as I believe, we are to prevent the advocates of a godless society to accomplish in the United States that which the Communists have accomplished in Soviet Russia. I canot sit idly by and permit this to happen.

This discharge petition does not provide any ordinary legislation but it will give the people of this country the right to decide, through their State legislatures, to amend the Constitution and reestablish the basic law of the land as we knew it for the past 150 years.

END THE KOREAN WAR STATE OF EMERGENCY

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced a bill to end the state of emergency which has existed in this country since 1950. I have two principal reasons for introducing the bill, H.R. 7408.

First, ending the state of emergency would require that Congress take positive action, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, to remain in session if our business is not finished by July 31. This might hopefully result in some effort toward shorter sessions of the Congress.

Second, ending the state of emergency would require an examination of the extraordinary powers which still accrue to the Federal Government as a result of this state of emergency, powers which—if still needed—should be provided by appropriate statute, not by the excuse of a state of emergency because of a war which ended a decade ago.

I will press for early consideration of this bill as a separate measure or as part of consideration which may be given to revisions of law to improve congressional procedures. I will welcome support from others who join me in these beliefs.

For the information of the Members, I will list a few of the provisions in law which remain in effect because of the state of emergency. There are dozens of others, perhaps even scores, many of them obscure and unused at the present time. The examples are:

Control over consumer credit may be exercised only "during the time of war beginning after" August 8, 1947, "or any national emergency declared by the President"—Public Law 80–386.

Contracts for supplies and services, under Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, may be negotiated without advertising if determined to be necessary in the public interest "during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress"—Public Law 81–152.

Contracts for supplies and services, under the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, may be negotiated without advertising if determined to be necessary in the public interest "during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress"—Public Law 81–110.

During any national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress, "the United States may have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession of airports disposed of as surplus under authority of this act"—Public Law 80–289.

The President may provide for the control and anchorage of foreign-flag vessels in territorial waters of the United States, whenever he "finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity," and so forth—Public Law 81–679.

Charters of vessels may be terminated by the Federal Maritime Board and vessels of citizens may be requisitioned "whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President"—Public Law 76–328.

LOYAL-TO-ORVILLE OATH DROPPED

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hundreds of conscientious, able ASCS committeemen who are trying to represent the best interests of the farmers who elected them, I want to thank Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman for his belated action in canceling his earlier loyal-to-Orville oath. His action announced in today's Federal Register carries out the purpose of my House Joint Resolution 413 which I introduced May 14.

Farm programs initiated by the Kennedy administration are not necessarily what the farmers themselves want. For example, the wheat certificate plan the administration backed was firmly defeated by wheat farmers in the May 21 referendum.

Farmer-elected ASCS committeemen should not be required to ignore farmer sentiment by pledging support for whatever control schemes emerge from Capitol Hill. I am glad that Mr. Freeman backed up and I hope he stays put.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recent reports of the groundwork which preceded the Organization of American States Council meeting July 3 are extremely disturbing. On July 5 the New York Times reported that Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson had met with Latin American delegates to the OAS. According to the Times, which described its sources as "diplomatic informants," Mr. Johnson had told the OAS delegates that Cuba no longer constituted a military threat to the hemisphere.

We all know the result of the OAS Council meeting which followed. The Council split on the efforts to apply stronger sanctions against Communist Cuba.

Cuba does constitute a threat to this hemisphere, and I doubt that any Member of Congress now in office would deny it.

Even the State Department press officer Richard Phillips would not deny that Cuba remains a threat to this hemisphere. In a press conference which followed the article on Johnson, Phillips said:

> Cuban-directed subversion efforts increased during the past year.

And evidence bears out this fact, as we have just seen in Venezuela where American oil properties are being sabotaged by Castro agents.

Even a special OAS factfinding committee states that Castro subversion is threatening the security of this hemisphere.

I strongly urge that there be some corrections made in our diplomatic community to erase the absurd notion that the American people want or will accept peaceful coexistence with Communist Castro.

This situation has been pointed up in a recent editorial of the Miami Herald, a newspaper which is known for its authoritative comments and influence in the field of inter-American affairs. Editor Don Shoemaker's knowledgeable analysis of OAS shows genuine alertness, and under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the RECORD.

WASHINGTON DOES THE SCUTTLING: AN INSIDE JOB ON THE OAS

When the Organization of American States voted 14 to 1, with 4 abstentions, for new curbs on Communist subversion from Cuba, we raised a question: "Was the lack of unanimity in the OAS Council due to tiptoeing leadership by U.S. spokesmen?"

The answer, it turns out, is worse than "yes." The influence of the United States proved to be leadership in reverse—away from instead of toward a hemisphere quarantine on the focus of infection in Cuba.

The OAS had scheduled a meeting July 3 to act on a committee report calling on all member nations to break off diplomatic ties with Communist Cuba and halt the flow of agents, money, and propaganda from the occupied island into the rest of the New World.

On June 28, according to the New York Times, U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, held a secret meeting with the OAS Council. The Times was told that Mr. Johnson gave the OAS delegates an appraisal of the changing conditions in Cuba and said Cuba no longer constituted a military threat to the hemisphere.

By contrast, the OAS committee had reported that Communist subversion from Cuba was intensifying.

The New York Times also reported: "U.S. officials who have been analyzing Castro's offers to 'normalize' relations believe they are motivated by a genuine desire to relieve external pressures on his regime at a time when it must concentrate on solving pressing economic difficulties.

"They point out that Havana radio's recent broadcasts to the United States and Latin America have shown less aggressiveness.

"Similar observations were made by Latin American diplomats who recently returned from Cuba. They said that Castro had personally assured the Governments of Brazil and Mexico that he would abandon his campaign to subvert the Latin American nations."

The State Department promptly denied that Mr. Johnson had reported a definite decrease of tensions in United States-Cuban relations. The State Department's official voice did not, however, deny that Mr. Johnson met secretly with the OAS Council.

What the New York Times reported was the impression gleaned from the June 28 session by Latin American diplomats. The denial, after the split vote on July 3, was too late to mend the damage.

The only conclusion we can draw from this set of facts is that the State Department tried to scuttle, in advance, the OAS program for united action against communism in Cuba. Although almost three-fourths of the members voted for the plan, its failure is virtually guaranteed by the U.S. leadership-in-reverse.

The State Department tiptoed backward at a time when most people in the United States wanted action to evict communism from Cuba. Incidents such as this make us wonder whether U.S. foreign policy nowadays isn't indeed foreign to the will of the people who must support it with part of their earnings and, if need be, with their lifeblood.

LOYALTY OATH RESCINDED BY FREEMAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call Members' attention to the Federal Register of Thursday, July 11, 1963. On page 706 you will find that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has rescinded the so-called loyalty oath. I commend him for it as about 37 House Members have introduced resolutions to rescind the ridiculous oath and I am please to learn congressional action will not be necessary. Let me also call your attention that in the so-called loyalty oath, or pledge, promulgated on March 1, 1963, every county committeeman, elected by the farmers, not appointed or selected by Mr. Freeman, would have been required to take a written oath that "he would support the program that he was called upon to administer." It is high time, and again I commend the Secretary, for finally taking this action. It will be well received by hundreds of ASC committeemen throughout the country.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order to ask the majority leader if he can advise us as to the program for the balance of this week and also next week, if he can.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as has been previously announced, the House will consider the District of Columbia appropriation bill this afternoon. When that bill is disposed of, we will ask to adjourn over to Monday, that is, if the bill is disposed of today.

The legislative program for next week is as follows:

Monday: Consent Calendar.

Tuesday: Private Calendar. Also H.R. 4897, repealing subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Wednesday: H.R. 101, peanuts for boiling.

Thursday and the balance of the week: H.R. 5171, authorizing the GSA to coordinate and provide for the purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we will be capable of handling this heavy legislative program next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, with the gentleman's able help, I feel that we will.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and one-half to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7431, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time we present for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1964.

Mr. WILSON and I have had the pleasure of serving with three new Members this year, Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut, Mr. FINNEGAN, of Illinois, and Mr. WYMAN, of New Hampshire. All of these gentlemen are outstanding Members of the House and have rendered excellent service as members of this committee.

We carefully considered budget estimates totaling $289,581,800. For the fiscal year 1964 we recommend that the sum of $284,286,800 be appropriated.

The amount approved for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1963 was the largest amount ever recommended by our committee. From 1955 to 1962 the District of Columbia's budget has increased $97.2 million, or 75.1 percent. This is right unusual when you consider the fact that the District's population declined 4.8 percent between 1950 and 1960. Money is not the answer to a great many of the problems now confronting the District of Columbia. More spending and more building will not answer some of the more pressing problems confronting us today.

The amount recommended for fiscal year 1964 is $11,365,164 below the total appropriated for fiscal year 1963 and $5,295,000 below the 1964 estimates.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five funds: a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary sewage fund.

Our bill provides for a Federal contribution of $30 million for the general fund, $1,924,000 for the water fund, and $944,000 for the sanitary sewage works fund. The Federal payment requested for the general fund for fiscal year 1964 totaled $32 million, and the amount that we recommend is $30 million. Only the A budget was considered by our committee and the total amount recommended under this budget is $11,365,164 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963. For fiscal year 1963 the sum of $30 million was approved for the Federal payment to the general fund, and certainly no justification can be offered for a higher amount in the Federal payment when the overall amount of the budget is considerably less than the total amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1963.

The committee has approved the request for $8 million in loan authorization for capital outlay projects financed through the sanitary sewage works fund. The loan authorization of $75 million approved several years ago by Congress for capital outlay items other than sanitary sewage works was exhausted during the fiscal year 1963 and legislation is now pending before Congress requesting additional loan authorization. If approved, then the B budget requests which had to be held in abeyance can be presented to Congress. If the Federal payment authorization is increased by Congress then, at the time the B budget requests are considered, every consideration will be given to an increased Federal payment.

Of the total amount recommended of $284,286,800, the sum of $252,124,000 will be used for operating expenses; $4,989,800 is for repayment of loans and interest to the Federal Government, and $27,173,000 is for capital outlay.

We recommend the sum of $16,910,000 for general operating expenses. This is an increase of $522,250 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963 and $148,000 less than the budget estimates.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has general jurisdiction over the regulation and improvement of mass transportation in the metropolitan district. There was discussion during the hearings that certain requirements of the Commission are not being met by the local bus companies, particularly in the following respects: first, overcrowding of buses; second, exhaust fumes; and third, utilization of air conditioned buses. The Commission is urged to continue its investigations in these areas and seek adherence to the regulations in effect.

For public safety we recommend the sum of $65,032,000. This is an increase of $4,541,400 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $340,000 in the estimates.

During the hearings we spent much time on requests for the Metropolitan Police and for the courts. In our Capital City we are fortunate in having an excellent police department. Over the years the department has been subjected to more and more pressures of all kinds, and it is time for the District officials and the Congress to eliminate these pressures. At no time in the history of the District has it been more important that the police department receive maximum support from the courts, the officials in the District and from Congress. Major crimes are quickly solved in Washington and no city comparable in size has a better record along this line.

Serious crime in the District climbed to new levels during fiscal year 1963. The people in Washington and the visitors to our Capital City are entitled to a system of law enforcement which will insure them the right to transact their business and traverse the streets at any time without fear of assault. The Metropolitan Police Department has the right to expect full cooperation from the citizens of the city and from our courts. When criminal charges are preferred and clearly established, adequate sentences should follow. Any deviation from this process makes a mockery of law enforcement and justice.

Each day more and more young people in the District are coming into conflict with the law. The unpleasant truth is that we are not even holding the line against juvenile delinquency. According to police records from July 1, 1962, through December 31, 1962, some 1,800 cases were referred to Juvenile Court. Only 20 percent of the cases sent to Juvenile Court resulted in commitment of the suspected offender to either the District or Federal corrective institutions. They are turned back on the street before the police are aware of their release.

Every consideration should now be given to a change in the regulations in the Metropolitan Police Department whereby off-duty policemen can be used as special details for Presidential affairs, parades, and other civic functions. At

the present time only about 400 of Washington's 2,854 policemen are actually on the streets at any given moment. During an average 24-hour day, about 1,150 men are on patrol duty or are investigating crimes, and about 1,070 are off duty or sick, with the rest performing administrative, technical or clerical work. Using the present procedure of assigning regular officers on duty to special details such as parades and other civic functions thereby removes from the streets available crime-fighting manpower which is sorely needed today.

For education we recommend the sum of $61,670,000. This is an increase of $2,165,250 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $139,000 in the estimates.

The illiteracy rate in the District is alarming. The percentage of people who are unable to read and write has risen in the District during the past 30 years, while illiteracy generally has decreased throughout the rest of the Nation. According to the Census Bureau, the District illiteracy rate is 1.9 percent and the national average is 2.4 percent. The rates for the balance of the country declined since the year 1930, but in Washington the figures show an increase in the illiteracy rate of from 1.7 to 1.8 percent in 1950 and 1.9 percent in 1960. Problems relating to education are among the more serious in the District today.

During the hearings, it developed that there is only a 15.8-percent participation in the school lunch program in Washington. There is probably no place in our country where there are more hungry children who desperately need the benefits of this program than in the District of Columbia. This matter was brought to the attention of the Board of Education, and the Board has since favorably reconsidered and approved an elementary school lunch program in the public schools. The committee was advised that sufficient funds are available within the public building construction program for transfer to the Meyer and Garrison Elementary School projects for the addition of lunchroom facilities, and that design changes can be made in the Green and Harris Elementary School projects to include such accommodations. Approval of these transfers and design changes is recommended as well as the incorporation of such features in future construction.

For parks and recreation we recommend the sum of $8,853,000. This is an increase of $288,950 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $10,000 in the estimates.

In answer to certain questions, the Superintendent of the Department of Recreation informed the committee that we have approximately 250 teenage gangs, each composed of from 15 to 35 members. Most of these gangs are bad and cause much trouble in the District. The roving leaders of the Recreation Department are working with about 36 of these gangs, and in addition are working with 413 individual boys and girls referred to them by such agencies as the public schools and the welfare department. This is a bad situation to have confronting our visitors and the citizens of the District. Again we call this to the attention of the courts and police department and to all those whose responsibility it is to see that such groups do not continue to exist.

We recommend the sum of $66,316,000 for health and welfare. This is an increase of $403,099 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $1,648,000 in the estimates.

During the budget hearings for fiscal year 1963, the committee ascertained that hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of drugs had been stolen from the District of Columbia General Hospital. The committee insisted that new regulations should immediately be placed into effect to prevent such a practice. During the current hearings the new director and his staff presented the program now in effect to prevent the loss of drugs in the future. Every precaution should be taken to eliminate this thievery.

Control of venereal disease is one of the major health problems in the District. The gonorrhea rate in Washington is eight times the national average, and the District ranks 12th among the States for primary and secondary syphilis cases. The committee again urges that every effort be made to bring this serious problem under control.

We have a number of improvements in the welfare program resulting from investigations started during the fiscal year 1962 by the Committees on Appropriations in the House and the Senate. The Controller's Office was established for the purpose of providing business and managerial leadership for improvement in the administration of the Department of Welfare, and a reorganization plan which is designed to put the Department of Public Welfare on a businesslike basis has been developed and is up for approval by the Board of Commissioners. In addition, the expanded investigation program and programs for the training of aid-to-dependent-children mothers are well underway. New procedures are being implemented which will prevent overpayment to public assistance recipients and prevent ineligible persons from obtaining welfare relief and surplus foods. The decreases in the Department of Welfare are due primarily to a reduction of expenditures in public assistance grants which amount to $1,138,956. The increases in this Department reflect mandatory costs relating to personnel services, annualization of programs authorized by Congress for a portion of the fiscal year 1963, and for staffing for new facilities required by increased population.

For highways and traffic we recommend the sum of $12,138,000. This is an increase of $684,225 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $115,000 in the estimates.

The problems relating to the highway program in the District of Columbia were gone into very thoroughly, both with officials of the District and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Any effort to bring important highway projects in the District to a complete halt is a serious mistake. In order to meet the tremendous day-to-day growth of traffic in Washington, we must carry the highway program along with any and all proposals concerning a rapid transit system. The highway program in the District of Columbia, with emphasis on the Interstate System, is one of the major long-established activities of the District government. Congress has followed a deliberate and positive course with reference to the Interstate System. A procedure for designation of the system was established first in the enactment of legislation in 1944; and after years of painstaking analyses of trends of engineering and economic facts, it enacted the Federal Highway Act and the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 which authorized appropriations and levied taxes to construct the Interstate System. From time to time various amendments have been added to the basic legislation, but Congress has insisted on its original policy that this Nation including the District of Columbia shall have an Interstate System. In order to have such a system, it must be continuous and to be acceptable under the law it must be properly designated. The Interstate Highway System will prove to be one of the most substantial and meritorious public works programs ever undertaken by this country. This program is equally important to the District of Columbia.

For 5 consecutive years, beginning with 1959 and extending through the fiscal year 1963, Congress has appropriated funds for the Potomac River Freeway and funds have already been obligated on the freeway in excess of $17 million. Additional obligations in the sum of $11 million are imminent. In fiscal years 1962 and 1963, Congress appropriated funds for the design and partial construction of the Three Sisters Bridge. These two projects are not in the embryonic stage. They are consistent with and a part of the national program and have been reviewed repeatedly by the Congress. The District now has $330,000 available for the Three Sisters Bridge and $1,248,601 is unobligated and available from prior year appropriations for the Potomac River Freeway. The committee approves the budget request of $900,000 for the north leg in fiscal year 1964. The Three Sisters Bridge, Potomac River Freeway and north leg of the inner loop should proceed without further delay.

For sanitary engineering we recommend the sum of $21,205,000. This amount includes $2,942,000 for the Washington Aqueduct. This is an increase of $154,462 over fiscal year 1963 and a reduction of $143,000 in the estimates. Here the reduction totaling $141,200 for the Department of Sanitary Engineering reflects the denial of 17 additional positions proposed, as well as the request for a total authority of $20,000 for temporary services for field maintenance and for contract or otherwise for maintenance and repair of meters. During the past few months disclosures of deficiencies in the work and performance of Department employees indicate that present personnel are not being properly utilized.

Currently there is a total of 27,253 positions authorized in the District government. The budget proposed an additional 511 for fiscal year 1964. We

recommend 361, which will provide staffing for new construction that will be completed and open for occupancy during the year and includes 180 firemen necessary to maintain the current staffing level under the terms of the legislation reducing the workweek from 56 to 48 hours a week. In 1958 the District had 23,163 employees and the authorized total today is 27,253. During the hearings we carefully investigated the number of top-grade positions which have taken effect in the past 8 years in the District. Again we want to call attention to the fact that too many generals and not enough privates make a poor army.

We recommend a total of $27,173,000 for capital outlay projects in the coming fiscal year.

For public schools we had 12 requests for replacements, additions, permanent improvements and site acquisitions. During the hearings the request for the Evans Junior High School was withdrawn, due to the fact that this item was approved in the supplemental bill. We recommend that the 11 capital outlay requests for schools be approved.

Under public library we have one capital outlay request totaling $101,000 for equiping the Palisades Branch Library, lay requests for schools be approved.

Under public welfare we have three requests and we recommend that all three requests be approved. You will note that one request was reduced from $642,000 to $325,000, and this applied to the heating plant at Junior Village. This reduction was made during the hearings at the request of the Department.

For highways, 20 projects were requested, and during the hearings it developed that the interchange C project and the intermediate loop project could not be placed under contract during 1964. Therefore, the projects were withdrawn. Certain reductions were made voluntarily and the item pertaining to the downtown internal transit circulation study was added to the street improvements and extensions request, thereby leaving a total of 17 projects. We recommend approval of all 17.

Under the Department of Sanitary Engineering we have 15 projects requested and we recommend approval of all 15.

For Washington Aqueduct we have three capital outlay projects requested and we recommend that two be approved, and the third project relating to shops and storehouses, Dalecarlia, be refused.

The budget submitted, designated as the A budget, was in balance, and the budget that we propose today is in balance.

As the Members know, several days ago the House enacted legislation raising the ceiling for the Federal payment from $32 million to $45 million. In addition, legislation was enacted increasing the borrowing authority for capital outlay projects from $75 million to $150 million. When this legislation is finally enacted by the Senate and signed into law by the President, additional requests totaling some $40 million will be submitted to Congress. A number of the requests to be made under this B budget are of great importance to the District at this time and every consideration will be given, not only to the capital outlay items proposed and to the increased Federal payment, but to all requests which will help us solve some of the problems in law enforcement, education, welfare, and in the Department of Health.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has experienced considerable difficulty in recommending a budget for fiscal year 1964 for the District of Columbia, due to the fact that a great many projects and requests are to be submitted later under what we refer to at this time as the B budget. We have carefully considered every request presented under the A budget and our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee on the very fine job they have done with the budget for the District of Columbia. The gentleman said something about the A budget in connection with the education program for the District. Will the gentleman explain to us what he means by the A budget, and if there is a B budget, what that means?

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas that the A budget as presented in January is a balanced budget. You will recall that for the first time in the history of the District of Columbia a separate budget message was sent to the Hill for the District of Columbia. At the time the budget was presented, the $289 million budget which we referred to as the A budget, sufficient revenues would be on hand and available to take care of that budget. In order to have a number of capital-outlay items for the schools, the Department of Welfare, and the other departments, there was not sufficient revenue on hand at that time and the B budget will follow.

Due to the fact that the increased Federal payment had not been presented to the House and in addition since the loan authorization of $75 million had been consumed, there was no additional loan authorization. As the gentleman from Arkansas well knows, this I believe was enacted in 1958. This has been consumed. There was no additional authority for the District of Columbia to borrow out of the Treasury and repay over the years for projects. Therefore, this legislation finally came to the House and passed 2 weeks ago. These two bills that have now been enacted by the House place the District Commissioners, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President in a position to submit to the Congress, after these bills pass the Senate, of course, additional requests which we refer to as the B budget.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NATCHER. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I observe that in this budget there is capital outlay for various purposes and a detailed analysis of the capital outlay for educational programs, referring to certain elementary and junior high schools for the District of Columbia. I spoke to the gentleman a few days ago about a controversy with reference to a new proposed junior high school in the northwestern part of the District. Incidentally, this is in the area of the District where I live and have lived for 17 years. I am somewhat familiar with the situation. There is a controversy as to where the most appropriate location of the new high school would be. Is that included in this proposal?

Mr. NATCHER. To what school does the gentleman refer?

Mr. HARRIS. I refer to the junior high school proposed by the superintendent of our schools to be located at North Dakota and Kansas Avenues. It appears that last year Superintendent Hansen asked for and received $650,000 for site acquisition and plans for a new junior high school at this location. It has since developed, after people in that community and the Parents-Teachers Association had considered and discussed it with Superintendent Hansen, members of the Board, and others, a Mrs. Kirstein came to your committee and made a very fine statement about it, and on behalf of the people in that area opposed the additional request for $3,200,000 because the Superintendent of Schools, they claim, arbitrarily refused their request to consider a more appropriate location taking into consideration the other two junior high schools in this section of the District. I understand from the gentleman's statement here that any such request would come in the B budget and is not included in this budget.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct. As the gentleman stated, several days ago he discussed this matter in detail with me. Again, I want to confirm what the gentleman has said in regard to this fine lady. She appeared before our committee and testified as one of the outside witnesses concerning this matter. She made a splendid statement. I should like to say to the gentleman under the 12 capital outlay items set forth on page 10 of the report, you will find that this item is not included. This will be an item that will be discussed under the B budget, and I want to assure the gentleman and all those interested in this particular matter that every consideration will be given to the request made by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and by others who are very much concerned about this matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate in behalf of these people in that area the consideration that is given to the request. There is an excellent location at the Walter Reed Hospital, right off the grounds, now available. It belongs, as I understand it, to the Government. I see no reason why the superintendent of the District of Columbia schools and the board should be

arbitrary about the location, particularly in view of the fact that farther south and not too far apart, within that area, there already are two junior high schools. The people, in my judgment, farther out in the District in the Northwest are entitled to this consideration.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and will say to him again that certainly every consideration will be given to his request. In fact, I am going to call the gentleman before our committee, because I would want him to come in and talk to us about it.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank my colleague, and I will be glad to do so and to cooperate with your great committee.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for a job well done as subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. He has devoted considerable time to giving these problems of the District of Columbia careful scrutiny. I personally feel that under his leadership many of these problems will be solved. As I understand the gentleman, he stated that the school system in the District of Columbia, the elementary and secondary schools, had not heretofore taken advantage of the school-lunch program.

Mr. NATCHER. I want to thank my colleague for his statement and say to him that during the hearings it developed that here in the city of Washington we only had a 15.8 percent participation in the school-lunch program, now with 120,000 pupils here and with only a little over 15,000 students who were participating due to the fact that they did not have adequate facilities.

As the gentleman well knows, as one of the top-ranking members of the outstanding Committee on Education and Labor, in the United States generally and in all sections where we have children who are suffering, as is the situation here in the District of Columbia, we have a lot more participation than 15.8 percent. In our own home State, it runs to a little over 50 percent participation.

Mr. PERKINS. Have arrangements now been made in this bill for a greater participation in the school lunch program by the District?

Mr. NATCHER. I am delighted to inform the gentleman that after we went into it, the Board of Education met and arrangements are now being made in four schools, as shown in the report, to start this program and get it underway, as it should be, and further that we will have more participation in the future.

Mr. PERKINS. The reason I mention this is because Superintendent Carl Hansen has appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor on several occasions and has discussed problems of this type. I personally feel that Superintendent Hansen is doing a good job. The school lunch program certainly should be taken advantage of by the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. I concur in the gentleman's statement and I want to thank my friend for his fine statement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Before yielding, however, I want the members of the committee to know that: although this distinguished gentleman is not a member of this subcommittee, he appeared and talked with the members of our committee about this school lunch program matter. The gentleman has been interested in it, not only since he has been a Member of Congress, but he has been interested in this program all down through the years.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure for me to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much for those remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] and his committee for doing what was necessary in getting the school board of the District of Columbia off dead center and getting this school lunch program for elementary students underway.

Mr. Chairman, we are supporting programs of this type in 80 countries of the world involving 37 million young people, but we do not have it for elementary children in the city of Washington. I hope the remarks of the gentleman indicate that not only will they start it, but that they will also as soon as reasonably possible expand the hot lunch program to all the children in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to assure the gentleman that we shall continue our efforts along this line. Again I thank the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee what disposition was made of the Soldiers' Home located here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that no testimony was offered to the Committee concerning the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home this year. Last year the Commissioners did not include the item in the budget. A continuing resolution was passed and adopted by the Congress which took care of the matter at that time. The Commissioners notified those in charge of the Home that some arrangement should be made for the fiscal year 1964. No amount was offered, and no amount was discussed in the Committee. There is nothing in the bill for the home this year.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and every Member of this House knows of his interest not only in the Spanish-American War veterans, but all veterans—and I for one want you to know I appreciate your interest and your faithfulness all down through the years—here we have a $49,000 item charged to the city of Washington. Prior to World War I, and subsequent to World War I, veterans had to come to Washington to present their claims. That was the system. Now we have district offices and we have State offices. We have a State office in every State of the Union. In the Commonwealth of Kentucky the State office is located at Louisville. Veterans no longer have to come in from the States to present their claims.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Might I say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I was shocked on Sunday when I was told that the Soldiers' Home had already been closed. I said "What happened to those 44 veterans out there?" And nobody knew.

Mr. Chairman, among the 44 veterans out there were six or seven Spanish-American War veterans. It may cost $49,000 a year to maintain this little home for veterans, but I had sooner see appropriated this $49,000 to help these 44 veterans of the Spanish-American War and of World War I in order to maintain this home for them than to see it closed. I would as soon see this amount expended for that purpose.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman says they have 44 Spanish-American War Veterans out there at this time?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. No; there were six or seven Spanish-American War veterans the last time we heard.

Mr. NATCHER. Let me say to the gentleman that it is my feeling that we should take care of the veterans, and I concur. I am a veteran.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I know you are.

Mr. NATCHER. I served 4 years during World War II and I am interested in the veteran, and in all legislation pertaining to veterans.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very sincere appreciation to the gentleman for the work he and his committee have done in this matter of the financing of the District of Columbia. I have served on the District of Columbia Committee for 20 years and I think the gentleman's work is outstanding. I should like to associate myself particularly with what he has said about the Police Department of the District. In my career I have had some experience in police matters. Chief Murray is one of the outstanding men of the country as a police administrator and we should appreciate that more and more as time goes on.

May I ask the gentleman, in his studies has he in a general way investigated extravagance in the operations of the District? It has been my impression at times that there has been a good deal of extravagance and that savings could be made in the operations of the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. First, I thank the gentleman for his statement and I would like to say to him as one Member of the House I appreciate his long service on

the District of Columbia legislative committee and his interest in the city at all times. I have not had a chance to cover that point but I have two sentences I would like to read to the gentleman.

From 1955 to 1962 the District of Columbia's budget increased $97.2 million, or 75.1 percent. This is quite unusual when you consider the fact that the District population declined 4.8 percent between 1950 and 1960.

Money is not the answer to a great many of the problems now confronting the District of Columbia. More spending and more building will not answer some of the more pressing problems confronting the city of Washington, D.C. We went into this matter very carefully. I thank the gentleman for his fine comment.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BETTS. I should have liked to have asked the chairman of the subcommittee a question, but maybe the gentleman from Indiana can answer it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to respond to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BETTS. In the report I notice that there is a discussion in the hearings with respect to the operation of the buses here in the District and reference was made particularly to the overcrowded condition of the buses and the air conditioning of the buses. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any assurance this will be given consideration, and serious consideration. During the years I have been in Congress I have had occasion to use public transportation and I can testify to the fact serious consideration should be given to that matter. I think the bus-riding public deserve better treatment than they are given. I wonder if there are any assurances that can be given in that respect?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The committee went into that matter very thoroughly, we discussed it at length, and it is our understanding a program is underway to take care of the problem of air pollution in the buses and outside the buses in the District. It is not only being investigated by District authorities but the Public Health Service is taking an interest in it and I am sure that Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital, will be taken care of.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have just a very few remarks to make. First I must pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] for the very thorough job he did in seeking out the justifications for this budget.

He was courteous to all the witnesses, interrogated them at length, and I must say has done a very, very outstanding job in preparing this bill which we present to you today, and the report which accompanies it.

Mr. Chairman, I also think I would be derelict in my duty if I did not commend the other members of the committee, Mr. GIAIMO, and Mr. FINNEGAN, and my good friend, Mr. WYMAN. I have never seen so much talent on a committee before, and especially talent which is specially trained and skilled in handling problems pertaining to the District of Columbia at this time. These men have all had experience in their home States dealing with the problems that weigh so heavily on the District officials at this time. They have certainly made great contributions to this study. As one who has served on this committee longer than anyone else, I understand their contribution, and I appreciate it and I know our distinguished chairman, as he stated in his observations, does likewise. This report was brought out of the committee unanimously. I know of no opposition even in the subcommittee, or in the committee, or in the House, and I certainly recommend we accept it as is.

Mr. Chairman, I must pay my respects to the Police Department of the District of Columbia. I have never met three more able and dedicated police officers than Chief Murray, Deputy Chief Winters, and Captain Wilson. They certainly have their fingers on the problems confronting the District of Columbia, and I feel they know the answers to those problems if we can give them the help they need. The chairman and the members of my committee have certainly taken this into consideration and we are doing all we can to assist Chief Murray and his aids in doing the job which needs to be done in solving crime in the District of Columbia. I marvel at how Chief Murray is able to keep such outstanding men at his side to assist him in this work. Also, of course, I am very happy with the progress being made in other departments.

I feel Dr. Hansen is making a contribution to our school system.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished member of this committee and the distinguished Representative from Indiana has been here since I came to Congress, because we came to Congress together. I heard the distinguished gentleman's remarks about Chief Murray and I want to congratulate the gentleman on the affection, regard, and esteem which he has for this great public servant. I marvel as the gentleman does that he will keep this job with the noncooperation he gets from the Commissioners, with the vilification and abuse he gets from the press, and the endless requirements made of him and the demands put upon him to keep the crime rate down in the District of Columbia. How on earth he ever does what he is supposed to do is a marvel. God bless him. I hope he will keep the position for a little while longer because there will never be another who will take on the job Chief Murray has taken in the interests of the District of Columbia and generally the United States of America.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his observation. You cannot pay a man to do the job that Chief Murray is doing. The best we can do is pay our respects to him and let him know we appreciate what he is doing, because I do not feel he is compensated for the job he is doing in any other way and I do like to scatter a few bouquets in a man's path while he is alive and not wait until he is gone.

I think Superintendent Hansen is making some progress in our schools. I am not in complete agreement with his utilization of plant facilities and teacher personnel. I feel as though the school facilities would be more adequate to take care of our needs if they were used for a longer period during the day. Being tardy at school at 9:10 and getting out at 3 o'clock makes a pretty short school day. I feel the plant facilities should be used for a longer period and the teachers should be used for an extra period which would reduce the pupil-teacher ratio and make for better work. However, I have not been able to get that particular recommendation adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I have nothing more to say; our chairman has done such a thorough job in explaining this bill to you. Again I say the report was unanimous. Every man on the committee made a contribution. Their observations were respected. I think we have a good bill and a good report and I urge the adoption of the bill.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I am a new member of this committee, along with my colleague from New Jersey. I feel one or two things ought to be stated that perhaps have not been explained. First, most of this budget is self-liquidating and the funds that are appropriated here are mostly coming back into the District so that the real appropriation is in regard to the Federal payment. The Federal Government owns a good part of the District paying no taxes to itself, and obviously ought to make this payment.

Secondly, I would like to observe that the A budget that is before the House at this time is a minimum budget. We all recognize there are additional needs in the District, but we cannot do anything about them because we have no authorization. This is not the fault or responsibility of the Appropriations Committee. When the time comes I am sure that those needs will be met by the House and by the Congress although I frankly regret that we have been confused and delayed by the two budget proposals.

The police department needs another 100 officers to help meet the crime situation in the District. There are a number of real needs in the schools, and so forth. A few things need to be mentioned in regard to law enforcement at this time because we have an acute law enforcement situation in the District, one that apparently is steadily deteriorating. If the Members have the opportunity I commend to their reading our subcommittee hearings, which are contained in a single

volume, starting at page 266 and running for perhaps 50 or 100 pages. In those hearings it appears, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the police are tremendously handicapped by not being able to detain individuals in the District for questioning, without an arrest, but with a detention for a few hours, such as we do for example, in my State under a uniform act by the terms of which detention up to 4 hours is permitted, but there is absolutely no police record unless the detention is followed by an arrest. I am at a loss to understand why this reasonable limitation upon individual activity, is not a tool which has been given to the District of Columbia Police Department in the District of Columbia where the situation of crime is so critical. It seems to me it is something the public interest warrants in an area much of which is unsafe to walk alone in at night. It is something that we all should be willing to agree to, in the interest of our common protection. It is perfectly constitutional.

Another thing that we in Congress ought to do something about is this question of the Mallory rule and other shackles which the courts have placed upon law enforcement officials with respect to delay in arraignment and its relation to the matter of whether or not confessions are voluntary. Some judges might benefit from some police field experience.

Another problem with us is the fact that our juvenile courts and many of the District judges have not given deterring sentences quickly enough and firmly enough to warn violators of what lies ahead for them if they break the law. There must be an appeal to the discretion of the courts who are there for life to make up their own minds anew to deal with this thing with real firmness, to face up to the realities of the need for public protection both in the adult courts and the juvenile courts. There have not been enough waivers, for example, to the jurisdiction of the District courts in the handling of juvenile cases where there have been youngsters involved in a serious crime situation where they are obviously not youngsters on a first offense but have a bad record.

I wonder if the Members of the House know that while the reporters from the papers can look at the names of such juvenile offenders the papers do not print them? This is a problem we have dealt with in my State and we ought to face this. The papers should print the names of those who are serious recidivists and report to the public on their crimes, so that others shall know who they are and may show them that they look down on them. Show that the public disapproves, this would help dispel the misconception that they are looked up to and achieved status as being "real" young toughs.

I have been impressed with the serious dedication of the members of the committee and this House in dealing with the problem of the District of Columbia. It has been the pattern of all of the conduct I have seen, that the problems of the District are very much the concern of this House, the District schools, its textbooks used in the schools, the morale of the citizenry here in the District, the facilities available in the physical establishment to achieve better education.

Understanding between colored and white people in the District was in evidence at all times in the hearings we held. As you know, the District Commissioners include a member of the colored race. This understanding and voluntary cooperation is something that we need. The District needs not more fear but more good will, and more of the kind of treating another person as you would like to be treated yourself in everything we do, not being forced to but wanting to voluntarily.

I want to say that the Members of the House who have the responsibility for municipal government in the District and for meeting the problems we all face colored and white are doing the best they can to make all of our people aware of the fact that the advantages of living in the Nation's Capital are pretty wonderful, and that most people are genuinely trying to get along together. I am confident we can have a better District if the courts will wake up and realize that the police are not brutal but are enforcing the law in the District in a fair and reasonable way with no discrimination. We have in the District of Columbia here a very fine government in which there is popular representation of the interests of all District residents. I am proud to be a member of this committee under the distinguished chairman from Kentucky who shares the respect and confidence of all who know him.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire on his contribution to this discussion on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and to state publicly that the Congress and the committee are certainly enhanced by his services. I know from his discussion of the matters pertinent to criminal justice that the gentleman's prior experience for 8 years as Attorney General of the State of New Hampshire is a great contribution to the District of Columbia Subcommittee and to the Congress itself.

The gentleman has called attention to a number of improvements that should be made in the administration of justice in the District, and also to the fact that 100 additional police officers are needed. May I ask the gentleman whether the additional authorization bill if supplemented by an appropriation—I believe we passed the authorization bill here a week or two ago—would meet the need for additional police officers.

Mr. WYMAN. My understanding, may I say in reply to the gentleman, is that it would, that the "B" budget will include 100 additional officers and will help to meet the problems of the District. While of course 100 additional officers are not going to solve everything, it will, in the opinion of Chief Murray, meet the needs of the District for law enforcement in the next fiscal year. I invite the gentleman's attention to this very question as it was discussed at page 286 of the hearings.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to join with the distinguished chairman of this subcomittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the other members in presenting this appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

May I say at the outset that, as a new member of the Appropriations Committee and the Subcommittee on District of Columbia appropriations, I have been especially impressed with the ability, intelligence, and cordiality of the gentleman from Kentucky. It has been a distinct and memorable privilege to work with him. He has demonstrated a vast and thorough knowledge of the complex problems facing the District, and he has also shown great courtesy and understanding of the problems which the new members of his committee faced in becoming acquainted with the problems of the District.

I have thoroughly enjoyed working with our distinguished colleague from Kentucky and the other members of our committee. In addition, I would like to compliment the staff assistant to the subcommittee, Mr. Earl Silsby. He was of immeasurable assistance, always well informed, diligent, and cooperative.

I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the officials of the District government. The Commissioners, their assistants, department heads, and other employees were most helpful and informative. They are a dedicated group of civil servants, and it is a pleasure to have had this opportunity to meet them.

All in all, it has been an extremely challenging and worthwhile experience for me to serve on this committee.

The membership of this committee is representative of virtually every type of community which can be found in this country, and I believe that each of us recognized in the District of Columbia's problems the dilemmas faced by all other cities in America. As we all realize, however, the District's peculiar problems of status place it in a particularly difficult financial situation. This year's deliberations, the results of which are reflected in the bill presented to you today, were further complicated by the fact that the potential increase in Federal share and borrowing power restricted this preliminary budget to those items already authorized by Congress. This "bare bones" budget is, at best, incomplete. As you know, the District is compelled by law to submit a balanced budget—the "A" budget, as it is commonly known. This budget, which we are taking up today, does not take into account potential projects or increases in existing projects. When the legislation to increase the Federal share and borrowing power is finally enacted into law, I know that I echo the sentiments of my chairman when I say that we will give every consideration to the pressing problems and the increased needs of the District, and hope to be instrumental in working toward the solu-

tion of many of these increasingly serious dilemmas.

This present "bare bones" budget under consideration, then, deals with budget estimates or requests in the President's budget for fiscal 1964 of $289,581,800. Of that amount, our subcommittee is recommending for fiscal 1964 the sum of $284,286,800, or a reduction of $5,295,000 from the estimates requested. This is a reduction which the members of the subcommitee thought was appropriate and a reduction with which the District government could still carry on its functions.

A study of the report will indicate the various reductions and the committee's justifications for them. The chairman has set forth at length the various items considered in the budget and the reasons and justifications for the sums appropriated. I would like to take this time, however, to dwell upon several of the matters which are before us today and which were discussed during our deliberations.

As I said earlier, the problems facing Washington are similar to problems found in most of the major cities. They include the problems of education, public welfare, crime prevention, juvenile delinquency, and housing. I know that all Members of this House are familiar with the problems facing education throughout this country. There is need not only for more and better facilities, but for an improvement in the quality of our educational systems. In the District, increasingly large numbers of students enter our public schools each year. We must assure that these children are equipped to cope with the increasingly complex problems of our society. Our subcommittee is aware of the problems facing education in the District. Our subcommittee chairman is acutely aware of the problems of our young people and his emphasis on full participation in the school lunch program is highly commendable and indicative of his concern.

The problem of public welfare in the District is gigantic, and the District's public health needs are growing at a fantastic rate.

And, in the minds of many Americans, the most appalling and frightening problem facing the District of Columbia is its rapidly climbing crime rate. The District of Columbia's problems are certainly not limited to those who reside within its geographical limits. Washington is—and must be—considered the city of all Americans. It is our Nation's Capital. There are no "visitors" to Washington in the true sense of the word. There are merely American people who are temporarily residing in everyone's city. There should be no fear in them—no shrinking from our city's streets.

But perhaps the most fearful aspect of crime in the District is the growing rate of juvenile crime. During our committee's hearings, we learned that between July 1, 1962, and December 31, 1962, 1,800 juveniles were referred to the Juvenile Court. But only 20 percent of these cases resulted in commitment. In some cases, disposition of the cases was made by a nonjudicial source. And, in many cases, young people were turned back into the streets before the police were aware of their release.

The matter of juvenile crime is of particular concern. We were told that in fiscal 1959 there were 3,191 juvenile cases referred to the juvenile court and in fiscal 1962 there were 3,897 cases—an increase of over 20 percent. These figures include just cases referred by the Metropolitan Police Department; not cases such as truancy or dependency.

In May alone, there were 400 cases referred by the police department. This is the highest monthly referral in the history of the court.

Some of us are concerned that too many of these juvenile criminals are being treated too leniently and released, only to return to the streets, there to commit additional crimes. In entirely too many instances, there seems to be a pattern of criminal progression whereby a juvenile criminal starts out by committing a minor offense and rapidly progresses to the commitment of felonies and other serious crimes.

I am not an expert in this field, but I believe we should look further into the disposition of these juvenile cases. I am concerned with the relatively small number of referrals which result in convictions—approximately 20 to 24 percent. I suspect that many of the juveniles who are released soon are apprehended again for the commission of a more serious crime. This indicates some kind of breakdown, not in the apprehension of juvenile offenders, but rather in the judicial processing of these offenders. Are we being too lenient with these youthful offenders? Is the original philosophy behind the creation of the juvenile court system in the United States failing us? Is it failing to cope with the increase in juvenile crimes occasioned by the urbanization of our Nation? These are serious questions for which we must find answers.

For the failure to deal properly with juvenile criminals merely means that we will have an increase in adult crimes as these youthful offenders attain maturity and that these crimes will become more vicious as these youthful offenders develop their skills and their contempt for the enforcement division of the law. I do not suggest that all cases should not be evaluated individually—each one on its own merits. This is the very heart of our judicial system. But I do suggest that cases should be evaluated by judicial officers—that they should not be disposed of in an administrative manner or by a social worker. And I do suggest that we must restudy our basic philosophy of the treatment of juvenile criminals to discover whether we are being overly lenient.

But perhaps the most controversial of the problems studied by our committee is the highway program. There is great difference of opinion on this subject, and our committee feels that these arguments are seriously imperiling the future of all transportation improvements in the District. The debate centers about whether or not certain highway programs of the District should be curtailed in favor of efforts to obtain a rapid transit system for the area.

I wish to make it perfectly clear at this point that I am not opposed to a rapid transit system for the District of Columbia. I am, however, opposed to a philosophy that says that rapid transit should and could exist without highways.

For many years, I have concerned myself with the problems of transportation in urban areas. I have cosponsored legislation to establish a rapid transit system linking the eight States in the northeastern megalopolis. But never did I anticipate that such a system would preclude the use of highways. The two types of transportation systems are certainly not mutually exclusive, and to promote one at the expense of the other is to invite intolerable and inexcusable traffic congestion.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Is it not a fact that funds for most of these highway system additions have already been appropriated? It is just a question of going ahead with it, is it not?

Mr. GIAIMO. In this bill, as I understand it, we appropriate $900,000 for the one project, but the funds have already been appropriated for the other two projects.

Rapid transit systems and highway systems are increasingly important to our urbanized areas, but it is equally important that planning for both be coordinated—that we have the type of transportation system that will take care of all of the needs of our urban areas—one which will meet the requirements of rapid transit commuters and one which will meet the requirements of the automobile users. And anyone who doubts that American use of automobiles is not increasing each year need only study the sales figures from Detroit.

The specific projects which the proponents of the mass transit system would postpone indefinitely are: the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, and the north leg of the inner loop. These are projects which have already been authorized by Congress and for which funds have already been obligated. Since 1959, Congress has appropriated funds for the Potomac River Freeway and funds have already been obligated for the freeway in excess of $17 million. In fiscal years 1962 and 1963, Congress appropriated funds for the design and partial construction of the Three Sisters Bridge. In short, these are projects which are being worked on now. These are consistent with our accepted and extremely popular system of interstate highways. It is my feeling that it would be extremely damaging and wasteful to abandon these projects. They are important, not just to the District of Columbia, but as a link in this vast interstate highway program which has done so much for transportation throughout America.

I believe it is also important to remember that two of these projects are expected to be completed within 4 years.

However, any mention of mass transit systems means realization years in the future. Some estimates I have heard range as high as 10 years. It is not impossible to have the development of both types of programs, but the abandoning of the highway program would cause immeasurable inconvenience to our citizens during the many years we will have to wait for our transit system and even beyond that date.

There is no doubt that the creation of a transit system would have an effect on the type of highway planning which would thereafter be conducted. But this does not mean that the construction of a rapid transit system precludes any highway program whatsoever. Those projects currently in the stages of construction and of great interdependence should not be allowed to die.

In the event that Congress authorizes a rapid transit system for the District of Columbia, I have little doubt that it will receive sympathetic attention from our committee. Until such time, however, I would like to echo the feeling that the projects presently underway should be completed.

Congress bears a great responsibility to assure that the citizens of the District of Columbia are given every possible consideration and that the citizens of the United States may continue to be proud of their city.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has made some very penetrating comments concerning the juvenile delinquency situation. He is aware of the fact that the number of cases referred to court is misleading because, in the first place, many of the juvenile offenders are not apprehended. Police only warn many offenders because of difficulty in getting convictions. In the second place, because of the delay in getting them to court, many times the complainant leaves the city or is otherwise unable to take the youngster to court. Then we have some other situations that compound the problem.

The gentleman is aware of the ruling of the court in 1961 which says that any voluntary statements made by a juvenile or any fact adduced as a result of this voluntary statement cannot be used against the alleged violator if he waived to an adult court. In other words, in an attempt to make a case against the juvenile the police gather all the information they can. When the juvenile is waived to the adult court their case is gone. They cannot prosecute because none of their previously completed evidence can be used in the adult court. I am sure, too, that the gentleman realizes what we need more than anything else is a local neighborhood interest of voluntary character without publicity, without fanfare, and without infusion of a lot of money, so that this juvenile problem can be considered by all the people here directly related with the problem and in every neighborhood. The President's Juvenile Commission here in Washington has under consideration several means of providing just such an approach to the problem. I know every Member of this body will want to cooperate completely in trying to combat the problem, which is indeed a national disgrace.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to compliment the gentleman from Connecticut for his very fine statement and I would like to take this opportunity, if I may, to clear up a couple of points that seem to be confusing.

As I understand it, the District of Columbia authorizing committee, of which I a member, recently increased the Federal payment from $32 million to $45 million. It is my understanding that the other body voted out an authorization which calls for substantially the sum which some of us were seeking to have adopted by the House. I understand this will go to conference and that there will probably be a compromise adjustment of the figure. But from the standpoint of appropriations could the gentleman tell me what happens at that point when this new authorization level comes through?

Mr. GIAIMO. As I understand it, once the Congress passes the increase in the Federal share of the District of Columbia money from $32 million to $45 million or some other figure and increases the borrowing authority of the District of Columbia, then, the District can again suggest its recommended budget based upon the additional money available.

At that time the District government would come in with its additional recommendations and estimates, which is called the "B" budget. Our committee would study them and make recommendations to the House. Also, I understand the District would have to receive authorization from the legislative committee for any new programs.

Mr. COHELAN. Could the gentleman tell me if I am correct in assuming that as soon as we do pass the authorization it is likely that the District Commissioners will come in with a supplemental request which will be presented to your distinguished committee?

Mr. GIAIMO. I can only speak for myself. I cannot speak for the chairman or the committee. However, it is my understanding the Commissioners will return to the Hill and make their request under the "B" budget, which represents the very heart of the real needs of the District of Columbia. This budget does not meet the present needs of the District of Columbia, in my opinion. Its real needs are going to be met in the "B" budget.

Mr. COHELAN. I certainly concur and I wonder if the gentleman can give me some idea as to when in this session of the Congress that would take place?

Mr. GIAIMO. The other body is considering a bill which differs from the one passed by this body and there will undoubtedly have to be a conference on it. As you know, there are two approaches to this problem—one passed by the House and one being considered by the other body. So I cannot tell you when additional action will be, but I trust it will be some time later on this year.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman expects before the year is out that there will be consideration of a supplemental appropriation to meet the needs of the District of Columbia?

Mr. GIAIMO. I would think so and I would say in my own opinion there has to be.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the outstanding chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] for this opportunity to talk on the District of Columbia appropriations bill of 1964. As a new member of the Committee on Appropriations and of this subcommittee, I enjoyed the experience. I learned a lot about the city in which we live a great part of the year, and in particular, I learned to admire the gentlemanliness, the thoroughness and the grasp of detail on both majority and minority sides so necessary in presenting for the consideration by this body of the annual appropriation bill for the District.

Of necessity, this bill, submitted under what is known as the "A" budget is in all truth a "bare bones" bill. But, even in the face of this fact, if this balanced budget fails to provide all those services that we tend to look for in a city of this size, our subcommittee provides a budget for the total of $284,286,000, which is $11,365,164 below the 1963 appropriation and $5,295,000 less than the budget estimates. Much of the time of our hearings was consumed with the questioning, by all members, of the heads of all the departments, the three Commissioners, the comptroller, and financial officers and such other staff as that at any time we asked to appear. The chairman has informed you that all of the capital outlays requested by the committee and compatible with "A" budget were allowed. Added to this was a necessary amount of $900,000 to complete the north leg also known as the center leg to the northwest freeway, an integral part of the highway program.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

This highway program seemed to have run into a roadblock when the President, on advice that we members of the Committee considered to be in error, requested in his transit and highway message that further work on the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, and the north leg I have just mentioned, should be stopped until the plan submitted by the National Capitol Transit Authority, which eliminates these three improvements, could be further implemented.

In answer to my questions, all three Commissioners stated that they were in favor of and have been in favor of these three improvements since 1959 when first reported favorably by the examining Commissioner; but since they are subject to the executive department, they are bound to follow the suggestions of the President. The same support was obtained from Rex Whitten, the head of the national road program, who recommended it highly. Our subcommittee was entirely in favor of the continuation of these highway improvements not, of course, to the exclusion of any transit plans; but rather we believe that a rapid transit system and an adequate highway system together is the answer to the transportation problem of the District of Columbia for now and future years. This is especially true since the support of a rapid transit begun now and not to be completed for 10 years would be far in excess of that already paid out or committed to the highway program. Therefore, with all the witnesses that I remembered hearing I can unequivocally recommend, with the report of our subcommittee, that these three, the Three Sisters Bridge and the Potomac River Freeway, both of which have had the money previously appropriated, needed for proceeding now and do not need further money this year, and the north side of the northern loop for which this budget received $900,000, all proceed with such speed as is proper.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Besides complimenting our very able chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], on his courteous handling and inimitable ability, I must further congratulate him for forcing, through practically his lone efforts, the school board to initiate in some circumstances, and expand in others, the school lunch program so much needed in the city of Washington. Coming, as I do, from a large city that has always taken advantage of such programs in places where needed, I had no idea how very backward this city was in this instance until it was brought out by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] in his questioning and in the evidence deduced at his demand.

CRIME IN WASHINGTON

I come from a city which has been sorely maligned many times and is generally alluded to in different parts of the world when crime and criminals are increasing in metropolitan areas. We in Chicago are proud of our reputation except in that particular. We do not think we ever deserved it, but it has taken a long time and we have not yet lived down the riotous living of the twenties and early thirties, all traceable, as we know, to the profits from bootlegging.

But, there is not the same excuse for the District of Columbia to have obtained, as they have now, such a reputation through the length and breadth of this country. Crime statistics can be very deceiving, as most statistics can be if improperly used; and I believe my colleague on the subcommittee [Mr. GIAIMO] put his finger on it when he told one of the witnesses that he was not interested in national averages, but he was interested in the average of large metropolitan areas such as Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Boston in comparison with Washington, D.C. When averages just considering metropolitan areas of this size are taken, we then find that the District of Columbia is very near the top in crime, juvenile delinquency, venereal diseases, and all of those unenvied things that go to give a city a reputation that requires years to erase unless attacked early and conscientiously. The committee, as you have been informed, was not satisfied with the conduct of the juvenile court where only 20 percent of the cases brought to the juvenile court by the Metropolitan Police resulted in commitment to either the District or Federal institutions. The remaining 80 percent were returned back from whence they came sometimes without police knowledge. Maybe they should have been returned back in most instances, but there were too many cases where they were tapped on the wrists from 5 to 16 times before the boy involved committed a crime of such excessive violence as to revolt an ordinary person and a crime adding to the already unsatisfactory reputation of Washington. Juvenile delinquency is not to be solved only by punishment, and none of us on the committee believe in punishment alone. We believe that education, removal of illiteracy, improvement of the public health program, public welfare, and living conditions of the people, through participation in neighborhood and civic affairs are necessary. But, there is no doubt that the handling of the cases in the juvenile courts left something to be desired. We have the promises of the three judges and the staff that corrections will be made. It is to the credit of our chairman that he insisted that all three judges and not some executive assistant attend the hearings at all times and be available for questioning and explanation of various cases that have been disposed of.

POLICE

I believe that we have a very excellent police department. I know of no better, and there is no chief that I could admire more than Chief Murray. Of course, he is wrapped up in two decisions which he believes interferes with the better administration of his police duties. That is, the so-called famous Mallory rule, which allows him no more than 6 hours of custody before the accused must be brought before a magistrate and be charged with a crime with the penalty being that any confession that is obtained after this time limitation is not admissible. This rule, of course, has to do with apprehension and investigation of the case for proper presentation in the courts and that is what makes a policeman, such as Chief Murray, mad.

He gets mad also when the Durham rule relating to Federal courts in this community is exercised. That is the plea of temporary insanity which is enough to absolve one entirely from a crime that requires intent especially when it is a crime of violence. This has led to some highly peculiar decisions. Peculiar in the fact that most serious crimes could not be presented without the prosecution having to be satisfied with a lesser conviction. An example of this is the man who raped a woman in an elevator when stopped between floors. He was convicted of burglary; rape charges were dropped because of testimony that he was temporarily insane. The rule used in such parts in which I live, where the right and wrong test is applied in insanity pleas, is not considered in this District.

In general, Chief Murray says he does not want any more money and actually does not need any more policemen except for replacements, but his complaint revolves around the Mallory ruling that I mentioned. As a lawyer, which many of you in this body also are trained for, I can appreciate the necessity of not allowing a person to remain in the custody of the arresting body too long. Too many third degree methods have extracted confessions, and I believe that most of the members of the subcommittee, four of the five of which I know to be lawyers, sympathize with Chief Murray, but consider improved police work might take up the slack where needed. There is no doubt that something is needed because some parts of this city are a jungle and much of the nice walks through the hundreds of trees and through beautiful scenery surrounding this great city cannot be taken under the fear of attack.

NIGHT MEETINGS

You will find, upon examining the hearings of the subcommittee, that a series of night meetings were called in the House caucus room attended by representatives of all groups and many neighborhoods, plus other organizations and interested citizens who wished to be heard. These hearings, from 6 p.m. many times ending about 10 p.m., extended for 13 days and full consideration was given to the people who appeared with statements. All of the testimony was weighed carefully and is included in our conclusions.

In conclusion, this is a good budget. It is the only one that could be submitted, a I mentioned, because it must be a balanced budget and must be submitted under the funds presently available to the District. Local newspapers agree that, as the Washington Evening Star stated editorially. "Under the circumstances, the committee did extraordinarily well." The Washington Post commended Chairman NATCHER and called our deletions marginal and ones that "can be absorbed without great trouble."

This body has passed an authorization bill raising the Federal contribution and increasing the loaning power in the same proportion. When and if this legislation clears the other body, then the pending requests of the District, known as the "B" budget, which will supplement the one being submitted today, will come up for hearing. You can be sure that we members of the subcommittee can assure you that we will give the same amount of care and attention that we have given to this one.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee on its

recommendations dealing with the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway and the north leg of the interloop. It has been my privilege during the last 9 years to serve on the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works. Yesterday we completed 2 weeks of hearings reviewing the status of the Federal interstate highway program and, specifically, its status in urban areas and particularly in the Washington area. I think practically everybody in this room would like to say that Washington is leading the Nation in the example it is providing in the construction of Federal interstate highways through this metropolitan area. Unfortunately, this is not the case. We found in those 2 weeks of hearings that the Washington situation was a sea of confusion and when we got into the meat of it, to find out why this sea of confusion existed, we found despite the recommendations in 1959 of every responsible planning agency in Washington, D.C., that the Federal interstate highway system in the Washington area should be expedited, that the recommendation of one agency which has come into the picture in the last few months, for all practical purposes, has brought the Federal interstate highway program in the Washington area to a standstill. This is the recommendation of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which submitted the recommendation a few months ago, that the Three Sisters Bridge, the Potomac River Freeway, and the north leg of the interloop should not be built at this time and, in fact, should be suspended indefinitely.

We heard during our hearings testimony directly opposite to the recommendations of the National Washington Transportation Agency—from the State of Virginia, the State of Maryland, from the Commissioners of the Washington area, from the American Association of State Highway officials, from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission—from all responsible agencies that worked on the Federal interstate highway system for many years.

All of these were united that this program must go forward. The key to this program is the expediting of the program in the Washington area.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress in passing the Federal Interstate Highway Act of 1956 increased the Federal gasoline tax from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon. We did so on the basis that highway users would get their fair share of benefit from the improvements in the roads in their areas which formed a portion of the Federal Interstate Highway System.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the present situation in the District of Columbia area, which contains at least 2 million people in the metropolitan area, is a penalty to the 2 million people, practically all of whom own automobiles and who are paying 4 cents a gallon in Federal tax every time they buy a gallon of gas. This tax goes into the highway trust fund. They should have the right to receive comparable benefits for the expenditure of that 4 cents a gallon. They are not getting them. The reason they are not getting them is primarily because of the obstructiveness of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this block has got to be broken. The people here are entitled to the same benefits under this program as the people in the other parts of the country; for instance, the people in my home State of California, and the people in other States. They are being penalized by a theory that apparently the National Capital Transportation Agency has that if they can bar any improvement of the highway system in the Washington, D.C., area, they can force sufficient support for a mass transit program.

Mr. Chairman, I am not against mass transit for Washington, D.C. But I want to say this: If this Agency thinks the way it is going to win more support in Congress is by obstructing the Federal interstate highway program, which was approved by this body by an overwhelming vote, I think the National Capital Transportation Agency will find that some of us who would otherwise support it will probably oppose it until the NCTA withdraws its opposition to the completion of the program for Federal interstate highway construction in the Washington area as contemplated when we enacted the Highway Act of 1956.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from California for the fine statement he has just made to the House. In addition I want to commend every member of the gentleman's subcommittee and the full Committee on Public Works. Certainly I think the gentleman is right. This is no time to bring to an abrupt halt the highway system in the city of Washington. I wanted to thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his remarks.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATION

Education, including the development of national defense education programs and for matching Federal grants under the National Defense Education Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1580), as amended, $61,670,000, of which $643,921 shall be for development of vocational education in the District of Columbia in accordance with the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been reading in the newspapers something about a "B" budget. What is a "B" budget in connection with the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], that under the present revenue here in the city of Washington there will be ample funds to take care of the budget that we have now under consideration. This is referred to as the "A" budget. This is the budget that was presented by the President during the month of January.

As the distinguished gentleman from Iowa well knows, some 2 weeks ago here in the House the Federal payment ceiling was increased from $32 to $45 million. In addition to that, another bill was enacted which provides that the loan authority for the District of Columbia is now increased from $75 million, which had heretofore been the case, to $150 million.

Mr. Chairman, those two bills, as the distinguished gentleman well knows, are now pending in the other body. When those bills are enacted and after the President signs into law these two bills, there are certain requests pertaining to the schools, the police department, the Department of Welfare, and certain other departments in the District of Columbia that will then be presented. I presume that the requests will be in a supplemental bill or in the usual manner.

Mr. GROSS. Approximately, then, how much will be added to the spending called for under this bill?

Mr. NATCHER. I am unable to answer the question. As far as the $284 million now up for consideration, of course, there will be nothing added to this particular bill. As far as the items that will be presented in the future, I will say to the gentleman quite frankly every consideration will be given to these items, especially the capital outlay requests and to any increase in the Federal payment. I want the gentleman to know that we will carefully consider every request that is made.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this is only a part of the spending for the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And there is no real estimate as to what future bills will call for?

Mr. NATCHER. The amount requested, I will say to the distinguished gentleman, will be in the neighborhood of from $35 to $40 million.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his explanation and I want to express my personal appreciation to him and the members of his subcommittee for their diligence in preparing this bill. Now let me ask this question: On page 10 of the report, under the heading of repayments of loans and interest, is there any money in this or anywhere else in the bill to take care of the financing of Washington's superduper stadium?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes. I regret to inform the gentleman this stadium which Congress authorized and which was to cost between $6 and $7 million and later cost $19.8 million and which I consider to be a white elephant, should never have been placed on the backs of the taxpayers of the city of Washington. It is now costing the taxpayers of the city of Washington approximately $800,000 a year in interest alone, not in retiring bonds but in interest alone, and we are having to borrow this money. Only recently a little over $500,000 was borrowed for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. You say "we." Do you mean the District of Columbia government?

Mr. NATCHER. The District of Columbia government is having to borrow this money. This is a direct charge on the city of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. How much will the taxpayers in Kentucky and the taxpayers in Iowa contribute to this? I am using them as an example of all of the taxpayers of the country. How much will all the taxpayers of the country have to contribute to finance this white elephant?

Mr. NATCHER. I may say to the gentleman that very little, if any, is coming from the Commonwealth of Kentucky and from the great State of Iowa. I say that for the reason that last year the payment was $30 million. This request is for $30 million. If any part of that $30 million would be applied to this, it would be very, very small. So I will say to the gentleman nearly all, if not all, of the money for the stadium is a direct burden on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. On the taxpayers of the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GROSS) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the stadium we were told away back when—1952, 1953, or 1954, somewhere in there, would not cost the taxpayers anywhere a single dime. This was to be financed by private enterprise. This ought to be another lesson to the House of Representatives that promises and assurances cannot always be accepted at face value, especially when a project is involved that starts at $6 or $7 million and winds up costing nearly $20 million. If this came before the gentleman's committee, how are we progressing with Mr. O. Roy Chalk in the removal of his streetcar tracks in the District of Columbia?

Mr. NATCHER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Several years ago an arrangement was made whereby the sum of $10 million was to be set aside in a reserve fund for use in paying to remove the tracks. This amount was charged to those who ride the buses and streetcars. It was a reserve fund that was built up by the transit company.

We went into this matter very carefully last year and again this year with the Commissioners. The hearings will disclose some 15 or 20 pages of testimony concerning this matter. That $10 million has now been reduced to less than $5 million and as far as the transit company is concerned, I want to assure the gentleman on behalf of our committee and every Member of the House that the transit company is not going to make one dime out of this transaction. I pledge that to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the statement he has just made, because I have been fearful, as have other Members of the House, that this in the end would come back again to the people who ought not to be made to carry a burden which is the responsibility of the Washington transit company.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WYMAN. I would like to revert for 1 minute to the "A" and "B" budget concept that the gentleman originally talked about. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is not a responsibility or a fault in any way of the Committee on Appropriations connected with this "A" and "B" budget concept. There is nothing we could do about it. It did not originate with us and it is not our responsibility. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. No, I did not really understand it.

Now, on the matter of the cultural center, is there any money in any part of this bill for a cultural center in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. NATCHER. I am delighted to inform the distinguished gentleman from Iowa and my friend that there is no money in this bill for that purpose. The gentleman will be interested in one point concerning this matter which appears in the hearings. At the time they came in to testify concerning the budget request for fiscal year 1964 we called the attention of the Commissioners to a little piece of land down there which sold for a little over $700,000—purchased and made a part of the cultural center. We asked them the question as to how much it was assessed for taxes. As the gentleman well knows, we had them put in the record the 10 highest commercial properties under assessment and the 10 highest residential properties. We do this for one reason only—to let everybody see how they are assessing this property. One of the large hotels here some 5 years ago was assessed for a little over $4 million and the gentleman in the well now asking the question inquired about this hotel which sold at that time for $18 million. The gentleman was correct at that time and he is correct now. We use that system for the purpose of letting everybody know what is taking place in the real estate field. In the hearings you will find where we went into the question of this $700,000 used to purchase this land. However, I would like to say to the gentleman that there are no funds in this bill for that purpose, and the $700,000 was not a District transaction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and I hope that subsequent appropriation bills for the District of Columbia will carry no funds for such purpose until at least the literacy rate in the District of Columbia starts going up instead of down, as you so well point out in your report. It is inconceivable to me that there should be anywhere from $35 to $75 million spent on a cultural center in the District of Columbia with the rate of illiteracy going up. A plush cultural center is about the last thing needed in the District of Columbia under those circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the very able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. NATCHER] with regard to a few questions in this public safety section. I see the appropriation that is recommended by the subcommittee for public safety appears to be an astronomical figure of $65 million. In going through the breakdown on this I notice that the present strength of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District is about 2,900. Is that a constant figure, or an increase, or a decrease?

Mr. NATCHER. The authorized personnel for the Department is 3,000. They have not been able to recruit some men from time to time. The total personnel at this time is just a little over 2,900.

Mr. DEVINE. I notice about $30 million of this $65 million is for the Metropolitan Police Department. There are 2,900 policemen. Is the gentleman in a position to tell me what the population of the District of Columbia is?

Mr. NATCHER. About 789,000. The District of Columbia, as the gentleman from Ohio well knows, is one of the few major cities that lost population in the last census.

Mr. DEVINE. Does the gentleman happen to have a breakdown of the ratio of police officers per person in the District?

Mr. NATCHER. I do not have that ratio, but I would like to say to the gentleman that for cities comparable in size to the city of Washington the figure of 3,000 is second from the top. Therefore, the number of officers we have is not too many or too few.

Mr. DEVINE. Not too many nor too few?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. DEVINE. I might inform the gentleman that I have the honor to represent, in the 12th District of Ohio, the capital city, Columbus.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that Columbus is a fine city. I went to law school there.

Mr. DEVINE. I understand that the gentleman attended the Ohio State University Law School. I would like to point out that in that capital city, which does not include the suburbs, the population is roughly 500,000 and there are approximately 500 police officers, a ratio of one per thousand. I think the ratio here is considerably higher than that, is it not?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is correct. There is one statement I know the gentleman would be interested in. At no time during the day do we have more than 500 police officers on the streets. We have a great many civic functions, embassy parties, and so forth, and a number of police officers have to be assigned to them. In addition we have over 16 million visitors each year.

Mr. DEVINE. On the other hand, in addition to the Metropolitan Police, 2,900 of them, do we not have the Capitol

Police, the Park Police, and some other categories?

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly right, but in nearly every instance when additional officers are requested the request goes to the Metropolitan Police.

Mr. DEVINE. In my remarks I do not in any way mean to be be critical of the committee. The fact is I would like to pay a high compliment to the Police Department of the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], and I, on a number of occasions at night, have accompanied some of the men in the ranks throughout the District to see what the situation is. I think they are doing a tremendous job under very trying circumstances. The continued rise in crime statistics in the Nation's Capital certainly is not through the fault of the Metropolitan Police Department. To the contrary, the courts, some social workers and professional do-gooders and bleeding hearts must bear much of the blame.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of this body, I have never withheld my vote for money to keep the Capital City of our country clean, beautiful, well kept up, and well provided for. Washington is our national showcase. It is the patriotic shrine of the American people.

I know of none in the House of Representatives who work harder, with more diligence and dedication, than the distinguished chairman and able members of this great subcommittee, and this they do with no political advantage to them in their home districts. I have read carefully the volume of the public hearings, and have been impressed by the scope and the depth of the subcommittee's inquiry into the problems and the needs of the metropolis that is the seat of the National Government. Surely our colleagues on the subcommittee, the chairman and all the members of both parties serving on his team, deserve our thanks and the thanks of the Nation.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I am unhappy and disturbed that the bill now under consideration has no money for the Old Soldiers Home that for 75 years has sheltered destitute veterans of all the wars of our country who had no other home. It well may be that the District of Columbia has no responsibility for the veterans from the many States of the Union who find themselves stranded, penniless, unable to find employment in the beautiful Capital City of the Nation for which they fought. I dare say, however, that the people of Washington, if permitted to vote, would overwhelmingly accept that responsibility and would vote out of power any city administration that sought to establish a reputation for fiscal responsibility by kicking into the streets a handful of old and penniless war veterans. That is not the spirit of our America that visitors to Washington envision when they gaze at the dome above our Capitol. Washington should always be warm of heart as well as clean and beautiful.

I was shocked when on Sunday last I was informed that the Old Soldiers Home had been closed on July 1. Homes for the three Spanish-American war veterans, I am informed, were found, one in Philadelphia, one in Virginia, one in Florida. For that I am thankful. An effort was made to place the other veterans, temporarily at least, but it is uncertain at this time that all have found even temporary shelter.

In the absence of a full report on the extent of the tragedy of the closing of the Old Soldiers' Home, and because of the inadequate time to alert and inform the membership of the House, my colleague from Texas [Mr. CASEY], and I have decided not to offer an amendment providing for some $50,000 for the continued maintenance of the Old Soldiers' Home. We feel confident that such an amendment would be adopted if there were opportunity to inform the membership of the situation. As it is, there are not more than 40 Members on the floor, and those responding to a quorum call would have scant chance of informing themselves until called upon to vote.

Under the circumstances, we feel it is wiser to leave the matter in the hands of the other body, trusting that there it will receive full study and attention and that, if in the judgment of the Members of that body the facts justify, the item will be restored by amendment.

My colleagues will find the case for the temporary home for veterans of all wars unanswerably represented in the testimony of Albert C. Allen on pages 1060 and 1061 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, on June 17, 1963, I wrote the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, asking what provision he was making for food and shelter for the sick and physically handicapped veterans if displaced.

Mr. Tobriner, in his reply dated June 24, 1963 stated:

> With respect to the operation of the facility after July 1, 1963, it is my understanding that a letter was sent on May 21, 1963, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, U.S. Veterans' Administration from the board of governors of the temporary home applying for reimbursement from the Veterans' Administration.
>
> More recently however, on June 13, 1963, Mr. Gerard M. Shea, administrator of District of Columbia welfare institutions and Mr. Mark Hutchinson, superintendent of the Temporary Home for Veterans of All Wars met with representatives of the Veterans' Administration's domiciliary facility at Kecoughtan, Va. The staff of the Veterans' Administration facility indicated that they are in a position to take all the veterans in residence at the temporary home, assuming they are eligible. This matter is now being explored further so that certain details can be worked out. Should the Veterans' Administration not be able to take care of the present residents of the temporary home, it may be possible on a temporary basis to provide food and lodging at the District of Columbia Municipal Lodging House for those who do have the financial means to provide for themselves.
>
> Representatives of the District of Columbia government will continue to work with the board of governors of the temporary home during this transition period. Please be assured that every effort will be made to provide proper treatment to the veterans in residence at the temporary home.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem reasonable to conclude that with sufficient time an accommodation could be made with the Veterans' Administration to reimburse the District of Columbia, especially as the cost of maintenance is much lower at the Old Soldiers' Home and the present VA facilities are overcrowded. To keep the Old Soldiers' Home closed to me seems both a folly and a tragedy.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I want to compliment the gentleman for his diligence and fairness in this matter. I, too, was concerned about it when this matter was brought to my attention a day or two ago, and wanted to make some effort to save this home. I, too, was concerned, as was the gentleman, that there were some men there without representation here in the Congress and who possibly had been forgotten. I assure the gentleman that if it turns out that his information is wrong, he will have my assistance to correct the situation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Were it not for the gentleman's counsel and help I am afraid I would have been lost. He has been a tower of strength. He was approached as I was very late in the drama, and after the committee had acted. I am very grateful to him. I know that he did have prepared an amendment to offer provided it seemed advisable under the circumstances prevailing. I know he joins with me in suggesting that the matter be more thoroughly looked into so that if it is justified an amendment may be offered in the other body.

Mr. CASEY. The committee has had no requests from the District. I think the committee has acted properly, and there is no reflection on the committee. However, it is unfortunate for someone to be overlooked for the lack of someone to appreciate him.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join with the gentleman in that feeling. I do not wish my remarks to be construed as critical of the subcommittee, which has done an outstanding job. I do feel that if the subcommittee had been completely informed of any phases of the tragedy it would have included an appropriation for the Old Soldiers' Home, and that if the other body acts favorably it will accept the amendment.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill

(H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

CEREMONIES ON THE CENTENARY OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in order that events in connection with the centenary of the Battle of Gettysburg be recorded for posterity, I include in the RECORD the remarks of Postmaster General J. Edward Day, Assistant Secretary of Interior, John A. Carver, Jr., and Hon. William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, be inserted in the RECORD.

The addresses were delivered from the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, July 1, 1963.

Postmaster Day dedicated the Gettysburg commemorative stamp. Mr. Carver accepted deeds of additional battlefield land made possible by the Pennsylvania Commandery of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion and the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association. Governor Scranton assisted youthful descendants of the honored dead in rededicating a new torch of peace.

The ceremonies were conducted under a blazing sun. It was a coincidence that at the centenary of the first day of battle, the temperature stood at the century mark.

REMARKS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL AT THE DEDICATION OF 5-CENT GETTYSBURG COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, GETTYSBURG, PA., JULY 1, 1963

One hundred years ago today there began on this ground a grisly battle that was perhaps the most crucial ever fought anywhere.

One hundred and seventy-five thousand troops took part. The fighting went on for 3 days. When it was over, thousands lay dead and 50,000 had been wounded.

Gettysburg was the turning point of the war. When Gen. Robert E. Lee began an orderly retreat on July 4, followed by a wagon train of wounded 17 miles in length, the last Confederate invasion of the North was ended and southern military power was on the decline.

Lee had hoped, by moving North, to gain several major objectives: to take supplies from the enemy, to capture one or more key cities, to cause a diversion that might help the Confederates, beleaguered by Grant at Vicksburg, and to bring fear to the hearts of the people of the North, thereby increasing the already formidable clamor for a negotiated peace.

Actually, as it turned out, Lee's drive northward had the opposite effect. The alarm created by the invasion rallied the population behind the Union Government.

Gen. George Meade's Army of the Potomac moved up the Shenandoah Valley into Pennsylvania to intercept Lee. Meade hoped to reach a line along the Big Pike Creek, 16 miles southeast of here. Although the huge armies engaged at Gettysburg, neither side had planned to fight at this location.

The series of bloody exchanges which took place in and around Gettysburg are still being studied by military historians and strategists. They were marked by brilliant, as well as faulty, tactics, by formidable gallantry, by stealthy ambushes, by brave charges, by terrifying retreats, by pain and horror.

The climax came with the last Confederate thrust. The gallant troops under Maj. Gen. George Pickett made their famed charge across open fields toward Cemetery Hill, but were mowed down by overwhelming Union fire. That charge was the high water mark of the battle.

Meade was much criticized for not pursuing and defeating the battered Confederate Army before it was able to escape across the Potomac.

Heavy rains hindered the movements of both armies after the battle. Lee reached the river several days ahead of his pursuers, but found his pontoon bridge destroyed. Meade procrastinated and Lee took his army across the river on the 13th of July before Meade could launch his attack.

President Lincoln was furious. To Gen. Oliver O. Howard, who commanded a corps at Gettysburg, he wrote:

"I was deeply mortified by the escape of Lee across the Potomac, because the substantial destruction of his army would have ended the war."

Union soldiers from 18 States were killed at Gettysburg. These States joined to purchase a portion of the battlefield for a memorial cemetery. The trustees of the cemetery invited Edward Everett, a former president of Harvard and Senator from Massachusetts, and one of the most renowned orators of the day, to come to the site to deliver a commemorative address. They suggested October 23 as the date, but Everett, whose orations were not noted for their brevity, replied that he could not prepare an adequate speech before November 19.

President Lincoln was invited to attend on this latter date almost as an afterthought, and the trustees were surprised at his acceptance. Lincoln and his party arrived in Gettysburg on the night of November 18, after a 5-hour trip from Washington. He appeared that night in response to a serenade and made a few remarks.

Lincoln was habitually cautious in his public speech and he mentioned that in his position it was important not to "say any foolish things." An irreverent man in the audience shouted, "if you can help it."

The following day, in front of some 20,000 persons, Everett delivered a 2-hour address, which roamed over subjects ranging from the funeral customs of ancient Athens to the assorted purposes of war. Lincoln's speech, which followed, was, according to historians, considered by many to be almost shockingly brief.

I find those reports hard to believe. I have never heard of anyone criticizing a speech because it was too short.

Lincoln was disappointed with the reaction of the audience to his speech. He had worked hard on it. It is not true, as the legend tells us, that he composed it at the last moment on the back of an envelope. However, even though the newspapers gave most of the play to Everett's address, Lincoln's remarks were immediately recognized as an extraordinary and classic statement of the democratic purpose.

Everett, himself, wrote Lincoln:

"I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes."

The Gettysburg Address was and remains a vital and eloquent document because it looked beyond the transient issues to the deeper significance of Gettysburg: The testing of the democratic idea and the endurance of government by the people.

Lincoln spoke of human liberty in universal terms; he realized that the outcome of the grim struggle would be of enduring importance to men everywhere, for all time. The stirring simplicity of his words gave the Battle of Gettysburg a perpetual timeliness and made it symbolize the difficult and continuing struggle to preserve democratic government.

Gettysburg was decisive for our present-day American role as the top world power. And, on the other hand, as the key battle, in the world's first so-called modern war, it was a tragic chapter in man's inhumanity to man. It should have been an object lesson on the horrors of war and of the hideous consequences of resorting to force to settle complex differences.

In today's world of a divided Germany, a divided Europe, a divided China, Gettysburg provides a beacon light of hope for reunification. In the face of disappointments and failures in our American efforts for a nuclear test ban treaty and for disarmament, Gettysburg should remind us never to lose heart, because the stakes are so momentous in the effort for peace.

In a more limited sphere, Gettysburg reminds us of two things about leadership.

The South, from beginning to end, had a superb top military leader in Lee—recognized as such through the whole course of

the war. On the other hand, the Union's Army of the Potomac was handicapped for the first several years of the war with changes in its top command. Lincoln had to make many changes.

We should have learned then, 100 years ago, how essential is ultimate civilian control of a military establishment. And we can be grateful that in today's world of uncertain, unstable, and makeshift governments, that we Americans are blessed with a stable and effective system of government as we pursue our national ideals.

I hope that the Gettysburg Centennial will make people think not of the specious glamour of battle, but of its abject horror and degradation. And I hope that the 130 million Gettysburg stamps we are issuing following this dedication today will remind Americans not of bitterness and internecine strife, but of the preservation of the Union and of the freedom and of the greatness of the United States.

REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., AT THE GETTYSBURG CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE, GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK, PA., MONDAY, JULY 1, 1963

If there were ever an occasion and a place where a listed speaker should be tempted to stand mute, this would most certainly qualify. What was said here nearly a century ago in consecrating this hallowed ground seems destined to endure beyond man's memory of the deeds that were done here. And yet, despite our admitted incompetence to vie with Lincoln's felicitous phrase or to match his somber eloquence, it is good that we return to Gettysburg—to the turning point of national history, to the place where national unity was saved, where the ideals expressed by the emancipator became possible of realization.

For Lincoln, the task was that of dedicating a resting place for the honored dead of his generation. For us, that period and its events—even its significance—must seem remote, almost contrived in the relative simplicity of the issues behind the awful struggle that took place here. We look at Gettysburg—and at Lincoln's expression of its meaning—with the perspective of a century. Having lived through a generation of depression, war, and a peace that gives no peace, we tend to regard the events of early July 1863 as a piece of the past that is walled off from present reality.

And yet, to reread Lincoln's message at Gettysburg is to be reenforced in our recollection of what was at stake on this field of honor and of sorrow. We see the issues of 1863 stripped of the partisan distractions and the heroic folklore constructed through the years. Lincoln compressed a decade of strife and 2 years of war into one declaration of faith: That the Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal should not perish from the earth.

That Nation has not perished from the earth—but neither have its ideals, so eloquently expressed, been fully implemented. That task remains for our generation to fulfill. For a hundred years, the equality defined on this field has been withheld from millions of our fellow citizens. What they once patiently awaited, they now demand as a matter of right. Unrest is at large over the Nation—and over nothing that was not basically at issue here a century ago.

We search for peaceful solution to the civil rights issues of 1963. Peaceful solutions have been found in many areas of this subject, principally through the high principles, the vision and the dedication to constitutional guarantees enunciated by an enlightened judiciary and by far-ranging executive action to assure that these guarantees are not denied, through artifice or legalistic sleight of hand. The President has now called for a new dedication to the equality under law which Lincoln defined as the purpose behind a bloody struggle a century ago. It is time for the Congress to respond—to give positive expression to the ideals for which men fought in the past. National honor, not the threat of civil strife, must be the motivating force by which all our citizens are accorded, ungrudgingly, the equal opportunity for which our system stands.

Thus, Gettysburg is more than a historical reminder, important as that is. It is just as important that Abraham Lincoln gave voice to what must be a national objective for our generation. It is therefore fitting that we should meet here to mark the further perfection of this shrine to man's highest ideals as well as heroic deeds.

I am honored by the privilege of accepting the public-spirited donation of key tracts of land which will help round out this national historical park. I commend the two organizations which are responsible for making this event possible. They represent the finest aspects of the spirit that motivates preservation of our national heritage. The Military Order of the Loyal Legion has an illustrious history of patriotic devotion derived from the forebears of its membership, Union officers who served with distinction on these fields. The roots of the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association also reach deep into the soil of this valley and the study of its history. In the finest traditions of the conservation movement, its members have excited the concern of Americans everywhere to protect these battlefields for public use and inspiration.

To these organizations, therefore, and to the many private donors of large and small amounts, I extend the sincere thanks of the American public. On behalf of President Kennedy and Secretary Udall, I accept these lands and pledge to the donors that they will be conserved and dedicated solely to the purposes for which they have been tendered.

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON AT OPENING CEREMONIES OF CENTENNIAL OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG, JULY 1, 1963

Mr. Postmaster General, Governors, and other distinguished representatives of the States, honored guests, members of the clergy, my fellow Americans; all Pennsylvanians join me, I know, in extending a most hearty welcome to all of you as we gather at one of our Nation's great shrines.

It is our hope that your visit will be both meaningful and pleasant.

A hundred years ago, nearly 160,000 Americans—some clad in blue and some in gray—assembled here to fight a battle.

For 3 days on this very field they dedicated themselves to the grim business of war.

When the battle ended, almost one-third of their number were dead, wounded or missing. The survivors limped away to seek the strength to fight again another day.

Man has an infinite capacity to commemorate his works of war, so a century later we gather on the same field.

But surely commemoration of a battle cannot be our real purpose for assembling.

If the grass and trees of Gettysburg came to grow again, despite the blood that soaked their roots, just as surely Americans can learn from what happened here.

If so, we need to know why it happened.

America on the eve of the Civil War was heir to man's ancient and natural desire to be free.

The propositions upon which our Nation had been founded were the most noble man has ever conceived.

The paradox of the Civil War is that it was fought with both sides invoking those same principles.

The North held that freedom would be destroyed if weakened by sectionalism and rebellion. The South held that it would be equally destroyed if an American lost the right to desert a government in which he no longer believed.

"It is safe to assert," said Abraham Lincoln, "that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination."

And, Jefferson Davis told the first Confederate Congress, "All we ask is to be let alone."

Thus a Nation divided itself. The Civil War was fought because this Nation's need to understand itself far outstripped the time and tools it had to reach that understanding.

The ancient struggle for human rights passed into a tragic interlude. An interlude in which half a Nation could look upon the gentle Mr. Lincoln as a tyrant. An interlude in which half a nation could look upon the gallant General Lee as a traitor.

Shouting the same slogans, fighting for the same broad principles, the American Nation went to war with itself.

Such a war could not help but underscore one of the great truths about our system of self-government.

Democratic society has within it a perpetual tension, a never-ending push-and-pull as it strives to work the will of the majority without trampling the rights of the minority.

We treasure the human soul, but we recognize, too, the material needs of the human body. We know that life without liberty is not really life at all. But, we also know that political freedom without economic freedom is not really freedom at all.

Unlike the other system which today competes across the world for the minds of men, we do not believe that man must give up his liberties to fill his belly.

An intrinsic part of our system is the belief that man is best equipped to acquire a fair share of the world's material prosperity for himself and his family when he is truly free in mind and spirit.

For us, freedom is not only the best philosophical system, it is the best economic system as well.

But most important of all, we know that freedom's business is never done.

In the days ahead, our Nation will be sorely pressed to put to use the lessons it has learned at great expense.

There is the continuing task of molding a government strong enough to fulfill its purpose, but not so strong and centralized that it violates its own reason for existence.

There is the task of regulating our business system sufficiently to guarantee the opportunity of its fruits to all, but not so harshly that we destroy the very system that lays the golden eggs.

There is the task of joining other free men in alliances of strength to protect our freedoms, but of avoiding the nuclear destruction of the world in the process.

And, there is the task of driving prejudice out of the human heart at least as rapidly as we are learning to drive men into outer space.

One hundred years after Gettysburg, America still has not completely solved the problems of self-government. But those who fell on this battlefield have not died in vain because our Nation today is great enough to keep trying.

Despite our sectional differences, the Union stands, firm and strong. The South grows with America, as does the North. And, the West has joined them.

"The new birth of freedom," of which Lincoln spoke, has not been brought forth painlessly. It was weaned on the persecutions of Reconstruction, and then lay asleep while the South revived itself and the North plunged into building its industrial machine.

Now, the new freedom begins to move again, this time into stormy adolescence. In the South, in the North, in the West—in every section of the Nation, men are called upon to look into their own hearts.

Written there, each of us can find the timeless truth: "Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

As the new freedom tumbles into adolescence, it finds itself in a Nation that has matured in most things more quickly than any in history.

None has grown swifter to power. None has experienced greater progress. None has been thrust so rapidly into awesome responsibility.

And, yet, the new freedom collides with the great enigma of the American experiment. History one day will explain this enigma, but we cannot afford to wait for history. We must realize now that, for a nation that in many ways moves too fast, in the matter of raising the new freedom to full maturity we have moved too slowly.

Most of all we must realize that freedom of the lawbooks—if that is all it is—is a pale substitution for the real thing. Real freedom is only to be found in the human heart. It is only there that one man can extend it to another.

Looking over the vast battlefields that surround us recalling all its memorable moments—Little Round Top, Devil's Den, the Peach Orchard, the Wheat Field, Culp's Hill, Pickett's Charge—let us resolve never to be torn in two again.

This is not a sectional problem it is a National problem. It ill behooves any American to point the finger at any other. Rather, we must reach together for the full promise of our common heritage.

Let us seek the future in unity, not division; in peace, not violence.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY "SICK"

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has been one of the Kennedy administration's most conspicuous failures. The basic duty of the Agency is to investigate the possible pitfalls of disarmament and arms control schemes, balance them against claimed advantages, and come up with sound judgments on safe courses for our country. It is not doing its job.

Fundamental flaws in legislation setting up the Agency and weakness in personnel appointed to run it both are responsible for its failure.

The latter problem should be remedied by wholesale replacement of the Agency's top staff by hardheaded Americans who understand what the Communists are up to.

To eliminate the six most glaring defects of the 1961 Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Act I have today introduced a bill to accomplish the following:

First. Drop the word "disarmament" from the Agency's name and eliminate disarmament from its functions. Some control over arms and armaments is the only practical objective which can be foreseen for a long time ahead. There is plenty of time to amend the act to include disarmament functions at some future time when world conditions might indicate. Meanwhile, let the Agency concentrate on the achievable and avoid the impractical.

Second. Bar the Agency from setting up its own research staff. Government research directors tend to hire people who agree with them. This is deadly in the field of arms control research as it immunizes against sound new ideas and prevents the critical analysis needed to dispose of unsound old ones. Conduct of the Agency's research by contracts with universities and private groups would tend to overcome this and bring a cross section of best minds to bear on its problems.

Third. Strip the Agency's Director of his duty to take part in international negotiations. Incorrect positions taken by the Director during the heat of bargaining, or for purely "negotiating purposes;" tend subsequently to introduce distortions into the results of its research. The tendency is to support the Director's positions rather than achieve correct assessments.

Fourth. Eliminate the Agency's authority to "disseminate" information to the public. The Agency should act in a research and advisory capacity to other Government officials responsible for initiating programs and making policy. It should not be permitted to "go to the public" to push its advice on those officials.

Fifth. Sever the Agency from the State Department. If it is to function as a truly independent assessor of plans, proposals and policies for the President, the Secretary of Defense and other governmental units in addition to the State Department, it should neither be supported logistically by nor housed within the State Department and thus subjected to its intimate influence.

Sixth. Place the reasonable expenditure limit of $5 million annually on the Agency. In 1962 it received $1.8 million, in 1963 it received $6.5 million. It seeks $15 million for 1964, more than a 700 percent increase in a brief 2 fiscal years. A $5 million annual expenditure rate can easily support all the Agency's proper functions in the field of arms control.

The Disarmament Agency today is a sick agency with a dreary past and a dismal future. It could perform a useful function, but it is not doing so and has lost the public confidence. Unless it is reformed substantially along the lines indicated, I see little reason for spending public money to perpetuate it.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, next week, beginning July 14, marks the fourth observance of Captive Nations Week, started by President Eisenhower in 1959. The plight of the captive nations of the Red Russian Empire must be and is of grave concern to a nation whose basic premise is freedom and liberty. For the past 3 years, nationwide observances of a Captive Nations Week in July have demonstrated the enthusiasm with which the American people support the hopes of captive peoples to be free. The fourth observance of such a week is a particularly appropriate time for the introduction of my resolution to establish a Special Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives on Captive Nations.

Communism is just as foreign an ideology of those enslaved peoples as it is to our own citizens. Armenians, Bulgarians, Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Cubans, Germans, Rumanians and many others, despite relentless Communist regimentation and persecution, have clung to their culture, language, and religion as well as to their independent spirit and their hopes for freedom. The Soviet Government has never been able to deal successfully with these nationalistic aspirations.

The very fact that these nations are a constant problem to the Kremlin makes them a source of strength to us. A report of the investigation made last fall by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs concluded that "The people of the Captive Nations constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States. Their desire to be oriented toward the West and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence serve as a powerful brake on the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist Empire in Europe."

Moscow has made obvious on many occasions its deep-rooted fear of the free world's growing knowledge of and interest in the satellites. It is the advancement of this interest and knowledge alone that can explode the myth of Red unity and expose their crass colonialism.

A seeming flaw in our cold war strategy appears to be our failure to exert constant and skillful pressure on Moscow in an area where it is increasingly vulnerable—the Captive Nations. Regardless of its outcome, the present rift between the Red Chinese and the Russians is certainly cause for comfort. Cracks in monolithic communism have become visible to the naked eye. It would be folly for our country to ignore such portents. Just as communism seeks to feed on unrest in the free world, we should be alert to exploit the individual yearnings and aspirations toward freedom vibrant in the Captive Nations.

The Soviets rely heavily on the propaganda line that communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism. It seems strange that educated people who decry colonialism fail to recognize the neocolonialism developed with such impressive harshness by the Soviets in Eastern Europe. At this time, when the Communists are trying to expand their empire into Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, we should strive to encourage the strong, restive forces within the Soviet Union and publicize their

plight as a warning to prospective victims.

Certainly U.S. foreign policy has been and is one of refusing to accept the status quo of Soviet domination and insisting on the rights of people to live under governments and institutions of their own choice.

There are numerous ways in which this policy can be effectively implemented. The Voice of America should give news coverage to Foreign Affairs Committee hearings on the captive nations, in line with the statements of officials in that agency on the importance of keeping these peoples aware of the constant U.S. concern for their welfare.

We should press for the condemnation by the U.N. of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe. The State Department should counter Soviet threats to Berlin by insisting on a prompt settlement of all central-East European issues resulting from the allied treaties at the end of World War II.

It is a matter of surprise to me that there could be any opposition to this resolution. The special committee which it establishes would conduct an intensive investigation of the captive nations. No study of this type has ever been made either by governmental or private groups. An enlightened foreign policy must be based on a thorough knowledge of the facts, such as this committee would provide. The investigation and the interest it shows could well serve as an effective weapon in our cold war arsenal.

In the best interests of our Nation and the cause of freedom, we should thus establish publicly a firm attitude in support of the captive nations. We must hit the Soviet Union where it is weakest by exposing to the devastating light of truth the full extent of Soviet imperialism.

OUR DISASTER WILL AFFECT YOU

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the production and processing of strawberries is an important industry in my district. One out of every three strawberries grown in America is grown in my district. It is a $13 million crop. It is safe to say that four times that amount is earned by processors, shippers, wholesalers, retailers, in other States, mostly in big cities, before the strawberries are consumed.

One out of every four heads of lettuce sold in the United States is grown in my district. Lettuce in Monterey County produces a gross income of $36.5 million annually. It is safe to say that shippers, wholesalers, retailers—employer and employee—living outside of California—mostly in the big cities—derive three times that amount from the processing and sale of our lettuce.

Without supplemental labor these crops could not be harvested. Lettuce and strawberries grow on the ground. They are very perishable and there is no governmental subsidy.

Admittedly, the withdrawal of the supplemental labor will be ruinous to our industries and people, almost all of whom depend upon agriculture. We need help desperately and immediately.

But also many more businessmen and employees throughout the United States will be seriously deprived of employment if the bracero program is not extended, or some other supplemental labor is not assured, immediately.

Thousands of new acres of strawberries were scheduled for planting this year in Monterey County. This planting has now been canceled. A farmer must spend more than $1,250 per acre to plant strawberries—field preparation, irrigation facilities, labor, plants, fertilizer, water, machinery, and so forth.

The defeat of the bracero extension has, therefore, already cost our small county $1,250,000. Only a small portion of this went to the braceros. This loss is borne almost wholly by domestic businessmen and labor.

The loss to businessmen, employees, and consumers in the eastern cities will continue for the life expectancy of the plants—3–5 years.

Many strawberry growers will relocate in Mexico where conditions are favorable and labor costs less than 30 percent of what they are in Monterey County. The pity of this is that all of the employment in allied industries—truckdrivers, packers, shippers, package manufacturers and salespeople, and so forth—as well as in domestic agriculture, will also be lost.

Importation of the small but necessary supplemental labor from Mexico kept a valuable industry in America. Without this labor supply this vital industry will be lost.

We should consider this factor thoroughly. Perhaps it would be wise and beneficial to every American to extend the bracero program.

TO PROVIDE TAX EQUITY WITH REGARD TO COOPERATIVES

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will correct one phase of the inequality between the tax treatment of cooperatives and that of their fully taxed competitors. It will also produce substantial revenue for the Treasury.

This legislation provides for the taxation of the exempt cooperative corporations on earnings derived from business done with the U.S. Government or any of its agencies.

Under the present law, income to tax-exempt cooperatives from the Government storage of farm commodities in co-op elevators or warehouses is exempt from the payment of Federal income tax when it is distributed as patronage dividends to the co-ops' farmer patrons. I believe that these exempt cooperatives should be fully taxed, just like nonexempt cooperatives and everyone else, on all income earned from Government storage and other Government business, unless such income is returned to the Government itself as a patronage dividend.

Section 1382 of the Internal Revenue Code, entitled "Taxable Income of Cooperatives," provides in subsection (c):

> In determining the taxable income of an organization described in section 1381(a)(1), there should be allowed as a deduction (in addition to other deductions allowable under this chapter)—(2) amounts paid during the payment period for the taxable year—(A) in money, qualified written notices of allocation, or other property (except nonqualified written notices of allocation) on a patronage basis to patrons with respect to earnings during such taxable year which are derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies or from sources other than patronage.

The inequality in this section is apparent. The cooperative that pays patronage to its members is not taxed on income it derives from the storage of Government-owned cooperatives, while nonexempt organizations are forced to return this income for tax purposes.

I recommend that this escape hatch in our tax law be closed, especially because competitive inequality results from this treatment. Because of the present agricultural surplusage, the volume of business in this area is very large, and I see no reason why all organizations participating in the business of storing Government surplus should not be placed on an equal tax footing.

TO EMPOWER THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE VOTE FRAUDS

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights to include investigations on vote frauds. This bill provides for the investigation of allegations that the citizens of the United States are unlawfully being accorded or denied the right to vote properly, or to have their votes properly counted, in any election of Presidential electors, Members of the U.S. Senate, or of the House of Representatives, as a result of any patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in conduct of such election. This bill is identical to one introduced earlier by my able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER]. It gives me great pleasure to join him in this proposal.

The basic civil right, the right to franchise, has two parts. If either part is missing, the right does not exist. These two parts are: First, the right to vote, and second, the right to have the votes

counted honestly. The National Democratic Party, a three-headed coalition, consisting of the northern city machine Democrat, the southern Democrat, and the Americans for Democratic Action Democrat, stands charged of violating one part of the right to franchise, the right to vote, through its southern head, and the other right of franchise, the right to have the vote counted honestly, through its northern city machine head. The ADA Democrat, though ideologically in support of civil rights, looks the other way when attempts are made to enforce the civil rights, looks the other way when attempts are made to enforce the full right of franchise in our country.

The basic point made by the southern Democrats in resisting looking into denial of the right to vote has been that there had been no showing of inability of State and Federal laws to enforce the right to vote. The very purpose of establishing the Civil Rights Commission was to pin this point down. The southerners have fought this matter "tooth and toenail," just as the city machine Democrats have fought successfully up to date the looking into the deprivation of our people's right to have their vote counted honestly.

The facts are that the deprivation of having the vote counted honestly is directed to both majority and minority groups. This is true both in the rural South where it sometimes takes a strange twist of having Negroes vote not once but many times over—as directed—and in the big city areas where the constituencies are made up largely of minority groups, including Negroes.

I am hopeful that our citizens will see through the hypocrisy of the National Democratic Party as exemplified by the position it has taken in respect to the right of franchise. The passage of this bill would be a significant step in the direction of correcting the inequalities that exist in the voting process that is so central to effective representative government.

INTRODUCING BILL TO SUSPEND DUTY ON MANGANESE ORE

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill (H.R. 7481) to suspend for a period of 3 years the duty on manganese ore, and its equivalents. At present, there is a tariff on imported manganese ore of one-fourth cent per pound of contained manganese. Ferromanganese, which is produced from manganese ore, is subject to a tariff of five-eighths cent per pound of contained manganese. This results in a net tariff of about $6.30 per long ton. The bill would suspend the tariff on manganese for a period of 3 years.

There are no metallurgical manganese ore reserves in the United States. Notwithstanding the imposition of a tariff for a period of 30 years, it has been impractical to develop any domestic ores. Less than 1 percent of the requirements are produced domestically.

Each ton of steel produced in the United States requires about 13 pounds of manganese. Ferromanganese is used to supply this need. Some steel producers have "captive" manganese production. The balance—or free market—comprises about one-half of U.S. consumption.

Domestic producers have seen a continuing decline in profitability and employment due to the increased impact of imported ferromanganese. During a 10-year period ending in 1962, ferromanganese imports have increased from 7.6 percent to 33 percent of the available free market in the United States. It is estimated that imports now amount to approximately 140,000 short tons. There has been no corresponding growth in domestic production.

The importation of ferromanganese at a rate of five-eighths cent per pound, which provides net protection of only $6.30 per ton, is inadequate to enable domestic producers of manganese to compete with imports. If manganese ore is admitted duty free, the existing duty on ferromanganese will result in a net differential of about $10.50 per gross ton.

The admission duty free of manganese ore will permit countries having commercial deposits to export more of these ores to the United States. On the other hand, foreign producers will not have the same inducement to ship their surplus ferromanganese to the United States under a rate of duty which compares favorably with the rate of duty levied on manganese ore.

BASTILLE DAY

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is characteristic of great revolutions that some relatively unimportant incident becomes symbolical and thereafter holds an altogether disproportionate place in the imagination of mankind. The fall of the Bastille played this role in the French Revolution.

The Bastille was of slight strategic consequence; its capture was not a brilliant exploit, and was dishonored by the cruelty of the unruly mob. Only seven prisoners, most of them detained for good reason, were found within its walls. But to popular feeling both in France and abroad the Bastille was the embodiment of all that is most hateful in arbitrary power.

Originally constructed as a fortress in the 14th century, the Bastille was early used for the custody of state prisoners and was ultimately more of a prison than a fortress. According to popular tradition, the first who was incarcerated within its walls was the builder himself, Hugues Aubriot. It was not until the reign of Louis XIII that it became recognized as a regular place of confinement, but from that time till its destruction it was frequently filled with men and women of every condition. Prisoners were detained without trial on lettres de cachet—often to satisfy the personal animosities of the monarch or his ministers. The most notorious use of the Bastille, however, was to imprison those who criticized the government or persons in power. It was this which made it so hated and caused its capture by the revolutionary forces to be regarded as symbolizing the downfall of despotism. The fall of the infamous Bastille seemed to herald a new age of freedom, justice, and humanity.

It is thus appropriate that Bastille Day has become the national holiday of France. For Frenchmen this observance has much the same meaning as Independence Day has for Americans. One of the many ties between our peoples is this common heritage of democratic ideals which animated both the French and American Revolutions. It is therefore particularly fitting that we Americans salute our friends in France on the 174th anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, which will be celebrated on Sunday, July 14.

CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES SETS NEW RECORD OF SERVICE FOR FLORIDIAN IN THE HOUSE

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that other business prevented my presence on the House floor yesterday, when my colleagues from Florida were paying tribute to our distinguished Member from the First District of Florida, BOB SIKES.

The occasion was to do honor to his having served in the House of Representatives longer than any other Member from Florida.

The House of Representatives has been deemed by many students of government as the greatest legislative body in the history of self-governing peoples. In all events, it could be said that no other body has exceeded the House in excellence of the lawmaking process.

To have served in this great body over 22 years and longer than any other Congressman from the State of Florida, is an honor of which BOB SIKES may be justly proud.

I am new to the House. I have not known BOB SIKES very long, but still long enough to have heard words of praise about his work in the House, both from his constituents and his colleagues. I have found him friendly, cooperative, and helpful, and I take great pleasure in congratulating him upon this memorable occasion in his career in this great House of Representatives, and to wish him many more years of rewarding service as the Congressman from the First District of Florida.

STARVATION AND THE BRACERO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the outrageously high wages paid to domestic farmworkers in this country. Yet, I wonder how outrageous the wages can be when the average migrant worker has an income of about a thousand dollars or less per year.

When we hear that a migrant might make, say, $3 an hour, we tend to forget that his employment will last only a few weeks—certainly no more than 2 months. And we also forget what kind of work he is doing. It might be worth the price.

My district is the home base for thousands of migrant workers. I know hundreds of them personally, and I know their problems. Their biggest problems stem from the fact that they just do not make enough money to live.

Because of that, their children might eat only one meal a day during the winter months.

Because of that, the insulation in their shacks consists mostly of old cardboard boxes nailed to the walls.

Because of that, the old ones who can no longer work die from cold, from hunger, and from exposure.

Did you know that in my hometown, one of the biggest causes of death among the older people in malnutrition? And do you know what causes that? It is hunger, Mr. Speaker.

I would say that a man is not making outrageous wages when in the winter, when there is no work, he must deprive his children of food and watch his parents die, because they have no income at all—not even social security.

By permitting braceros to come into this country, we depress these outrageous wages to a point below that of human tolerance. It is partially because of the bracero program that I have seen children ragged and hungry and old people dying of malnutrition.

MIGRANT'S PLIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in our discussion of the bracero program, we have heard some pretty fantastic defenses of it. Last week we were told that the best thing we can do for American migrant workers would be to take their jobs away.

This brought some interesting reactions. I would like to relate part of a letter I received today from a migrant worker in California.

This worker asks:

Is it humanitarian to bring cheap foreign labor and force us migrant workers to either work for the same wages as the bracero, or else starve, or if we are lucky receive charity from the welfare department? Either one is bad.

The migrant way is not an ideal way of life, it is true, but some of us have been doing this for many years, and are happy working this way provided we earn enough to feed our families. This is a free country, and if some of us are forced to live that way, we should be allowed to do so. Don't try to stop it by bringing cheap foreign labor to replace us, thinking you are doing us a favor. Yes, we would like to live in one place and form a part of a community but here again we are discriminated (against) in the better jobs.

Give the solution you have for the migrant worker, if you keep on bringing braceros, what are we to do?

I submit that this letter is not very grammatical. But it tells very clearly the problem facing the American migrant if the bracero program is extended.

If we want to offer a humanitarian solution to the problems of the American migrant worker, we should give him a break in the labor market by eliminating the wage-depressing factor of foreign workers. If we are interested in being humanitarian, we should do this and enact the proposals of Senator WILLIAMS, which would, in fact, help the migrant.

What is certain is that you cannot help a man by taking his job away from him or depressing his wages.

EXEMPTION FROM INDUCTION OF THE SOLE SURVIVING SON OF A FAMILY WHOSE FATHER DIES AS A RESULT OF MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee has favorably reported H.R. 2664, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father dies as a result of military service.

I sponsored an identical measure, H.R. 4828, and the following is my testimony before the Armed Services Committee on behalf of H.R. 4828:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4828 BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, JUNE 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in support of my bill H.R. 4828, which would amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father dies as a result of military service.

Present law provides that where one or more sons or daughters of a family was killed in action or died in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Services of the United States, or who subsequently died as a result of injuries or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service.

H.R. 4828 would amend this to read "Where the father or one or more sons or daughters * * *" etc. It is as simple as that.

I know of no opposition to this bill and I do know that it is endorsed by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States and by the Gold Star Mothers of America, Inc.

Furthermore, the report on H.R. 2664 (which is identical to H.R. 4828) shows that the Department of the Army in behalf of the Department of Defense endorses the principle of the bill and that Gen. Louis B. Hershey, Director of the selective service system, has also notified the committee that he would not oppose enactment of this legislation.

The Department of the Army, in its report dated March 28, 1963, has offered an amendment to the bill which is entirely acceptable to me and in fact improves the bill. This amendment would add to the end of section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act the words, "unless he volunteers for induction."

The Department states that this legislation would preclude the induction of volunteers as well as nonvolunteers. I can see no necessity for barring voluntary enlistments.

In view of the support that this bill has and in fairness to those families who have a sole surviving son of a father who gave his life to his country, I urge the enactment of H.R. 4828 with the suggested amendment. Thank you.

NATO 5 YEARS LATER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the security of the United States and the free world has been in good part preserved through the effective efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Since its origin, our NATO alliance has produced a strong and cohesive defense system and, in addition, has enlarged its scope to include cooperation in nonmilitary areas. I, myself, have witnessed progress in the latter sphere as a U.S. delegate to the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, whose latest meeting I have recently attended in Paris, where I served as a member of the Scientific and Technical Committee.

Today I bring to your attention an excellent and informative article appraising NATO's achievements in the area of defense. Written by the distinguished Gen. Lauris Norstad, the former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, the piece appears in the April-June issue of the General Electric Forum for National Security and Free World Progress along with several other outstanding articles on developments in the field of defense.

I recommend to all my colleagues General Norstad's evaluation and am inserting it at this point in the RECORD in the hope that we shall all profit from his expert analysis.

NATO 5 Years Later: The Shield Is Stronger, the Sword Is Sharper

(By Gen. Lauris Norstad, USAF, retired, former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe)

To millions of free people throughout Europe, as well as here in the United States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization spells security. Established in the critical time that saw the loss of Czechoslovakia to the Communists and first witnessed the brutal blockade of Berlin, NATO has preserved the peace for over 14 years and the Atlantic community has prospered and grown strong.

Despite some very real differences, the basic unity of this alliance is unmatched in the long history of political and military alliances. The best examples of that cohesion have been provided by the various and recurring crises in Berlin. But the Cuban crisis gave us another outstanding, perhaps even spectacular, illustration of Allied unity.

On that important Monday evening last October when President Kennedy disclosed the serious situation in Cuba to the American public, Mr. Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State and special envoy of the President, was presenting the United States position to the North Atlantic Council in Paris. Promptly and unanimously, the other 14 sovereign nations of NATO resolved to stand positively behind the United States in the face of this grave threat to world peace, a stand which must have been as encouraging to President Kennedy as it was chilling to Premier Khrushchev. Here was proof of unity when unity truly counted, proof positive of what had been built out of the despair that was Europe following World War II.

POSTWAR EUROPE: APATHY AND DESPAIR

The memory I have of Europe in the late 1940's and early 1950's—and a powerful memory it is—is of a climate of apathy and despair. The signs were everywhere in the streets crowded with unemployed, in the nearly empty stores, in the smokeless factories. But it was most sharply etched in the faces of the people themselves, on which were written the fear and hopelessness of that hour. The prevailing question was not whether war would come again, but rather in what month, on what day.

Between the then and the now, the contrast is all but unbelievable. Today we see a Europe that is strong, dynamic, confident. It is a Europe in which American policy has made humble the success of their own efforts.

For more than a decade after the war, the weakness of Europe was a major factor influencing the policy of this country. But now we are no longer dealing with war-shattered peoples. We are dealing with countries which on the basis of their improved status, their achievements in recent years, are demanding an increasing recognition as true partners. And with rights and recognition they are appreciating to a greater extent the increased obligations to the alliance and beyond. So in the decade ahead, it is the strength of Europe, rather than the weakness, which will play a major role in shaping our plans, our programs, and our objectives as a nation.

INTERNAL NATO DIFFERENCES

But against the background of a strong Europe and the unity of the alliance is what appears to be something of a crisis in the relationships within it. This past winter and spring have brought this fact into sharp focus. That weaknesses do exist, some quite serious, is a matter of public record, but this can be said of almost anything that has been built rather rapidly and that is compelled to adapt itself to changing needs. On the other hand, the fact that the alliance possesses very real military strength, both conventional and nuclear, is also recognized.

To gain perspective today, NATO's internal trouble must be looked upon in the context of its strength as well as its weaknesses, of its unity as well as its division. There are common aims within NATO which are just as valid, whose achievement is just as important, and whose common application and acceptance are just as apparent today as when first announced in the NATO Treaty.

A TIME FOR STATESMANSHIP

There is no doubt that this is a critical time. It is a time for tolerance and understanding. And it is a time for statesmanship of the highest quality. As President Kennedy has said, "* * * that which serves to unite us is right, and what tends to divide us is wrong. * * * If we are to be worthy of our historic trust, we must continue on both sides of the Atlantic to work together in trust."

Some of the present difficulty, perhaps most of it, springs from the fact that the Europeans with their new strength, their new feeling of power, their understandable self-assertiveness, are preoccupied with the development of new political alinements. Of course, the future Europe will be defined by Europeans, and that is as it should be. But those who think in terms of strictly national solutions are fortunately clearly in the minority. In fact, even the idea of an independent European bloc is not gaining support. It is my own conviction that the pattern of the future will be the full pattern of the Atlantic community.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS DECISIONS

One of the vital areas in which Europeans are developing this new self-assertiveness concerns use of nuclear weapons. Since nuclear weapons have become such a symbol of power in our time, their importance in policy considerations has taken on the very greatest dimension. At the heart of these considerations is an important question concerning the focus of authority and how that authority should be exercised.

Most Europeans are convinced that nuclear weapons, in some strength and in some form, are essential to their defense. However, they want a guarantee of the continuing availability of the weapons on which they must place dependence for the preservation of their freedom. Further, they wish a voice, an influence, in the decisionmaking process. They feel they need this in order to fulfill their responsibilities to their own people as well as to the alliance.

These convictions are very real to the Europeans and they are certainly reasonable. Like the renewed strength of Europe, they must be accepted as a fact of life.

COLLECTIVE NUCLEAR AUTHORITY

The authority over the nuclear capability which supports the NATO defense plans should be vested in the alliance itself. To meet this need, the nuclear weapons deployed for the purpose of giving reality and substance to the NATO principles should be wholly committed to the alliance.

However, since the proliferation of independent nuclear control and authority is unacceptable, the actual physical custody of the weapons or warheads should be retained by the donor country. But in principle, the responsibility relating to the NATO nuclear capability is a collective one and must be shared by all of the 15 member countries.

One answer to the problem of collective authority would be for the Council to create a smaller executive body wholly responsive to it. In its simplest form, this body might consist of a representative from each NATO nuclear power—the United States, United Kingdom, and France. So that views from all 15 countries are heard, the Secretary General, who serves all member countries, could preside over this executive group.

Such a formula would permit the NATO political authorities to exercise powers promptly in a military emergency. And it may meet some of the desires and demands of the Europeans for a real voice in the control of military power, particularly nuclear power.

EARLY ANSWER IS VITAL

This proposal certainly involves difficulties. There are technical problems of organization. And there may well be problems of law. There are certainly political involvements perhaps most especially for those NATO members who would not be included in a three-, four-, or five-member executive body.

However, I am sure that our European Allies will consider any constructive proposal. They realize, at least as well as we do on this side of the Atlantic, that the future of the alliance may well depend on an early answer to the question of authority over the NATO nuclear capability.

TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Paralleling the rapid rise in Europe's strength has been NATO's progress in the development and deployment of substantial conventional armed forces, including tactical nuclear weapons. In the event of a future aggressive action against the alliance, we will not be engaged in the traditional continental war, moving back and forth, yielding and regaining great stretches of territory. There will be movement, of course; but where World War II lasted 6 years, we now think in terms of 6 months, perhaps 6 weeks, or even 6 days. Therefore, our conventional forces will probably have to hold their Iron Curtain line for only a limited period.

In this case, "hold" does not mean a skeleton force standing man-to-man in a trench line. A true and effective defense means quite substantial conventional forces, plus the availability of tactical nuclear weapons. Now if we leave any questions about our determination to use even our tactical nuclear weapons, our Davy Crocketts, for instance, we will be leaving a gaping hole in our armor of deterrent effort. We must remember that selective use of limited tactical nuclear weapons in such situations will not necessarily result in all-out conflict although it could possibly boost the risks of a total war.

A COMPLEX AND DEMANDING RESPONSIBILITY

So in the light of the tactical and strategic nuclear strength on both sides today, this generation may well face a responsibility more complex and demanding than any other has faced. The terrible destructiveness of modern war places upon us all a most urgent responsibility for devising means that will prevent such a war.

The choice before us is immensely difficult and lies within firmly fixed limits: we must reduce the risk of war with all its catastrophic effects, but we cannot weaken the guarantees of freedom. We cannot forfeit the means of defending liberty, without which we could not live.

Since World War II, the record of the NATO alliance shows a continuous search for peace. Some time ago a London newspaper assessed our progress by saying that even the simple word that stands for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—has itself "come to be synonymous with other combinations of letters which also stir deep emotions in the hearts of men—freedom, peace, independence, human comradeship, the will to survive."

With its habit of working together and its long record of unity against external threats, NATO offers the best hope for solving the problems which threaten to divide us now. The measure of the alliance's past shows strength and unity, shows courage and imagination, shows an even stronger basis for hope. It gives assurance that there will be a tomorrow. And it gives promise that tomorrow will be good.

HERE ARE GENERAL NORSTAD'S ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS POSED BY THE FORUM EDITORS

Question. General Norstad, 5 years ago, in the General Electric Defense Quarterly, predecessor to the Forum, you said that our strategic nuclear power is the "heaviest factor on our side of the international equation." In the face of what has been termed a "nuclear standoff" between the United States and the U.S.S.R. today, do you still feel this is true?

Answer. Our strategic nuclear power still provides the foundation on which we are building a large part of the rest of our defense posture—our ground, air, and naval forces. It would be sheer irresponsibility to try to meet our military security requirements without the foundation of a nuclear deterrent. Although its form is changing somewhat—greater emphasis on long-range missiles and less on manned aircraft the strategic nuclear force is no less important today than it has been in the past.

Question. You have said before that our troops are in Europe not only for the defense of Europe, but equally for the defense, from Europe, of the United States. Has this indicated to Europeans that we want to defend our homeland from their soil?

Answer. A short time ago, I would have said emphaticaly not. I would have said that they are thoroughly convinced that the alliance is truly an act of partnership, that they recognize we are all in it together, and that they know we are really committed to a common line of defense.

But in the last few months, more and more comments have been emanating from Europe to the effect that perhaps the United States does not really want to fight for them. However, regardless of these comments, I don't think this is what the Europeans really believe. I think they feel—as we do—that the first line of defense is the same for Europeans as it is for us.

Although this is a critical period for the alliance, I think it should be looked upon as simply a rough spot on the road to unity and security, and not as a real block or obstacle. Occasionally, the attitudes of the present cloud the long-range goals for the future and the strong unity and support of the past. And sometimes statements are issued merely for effect. So I would consider the present difficulty as merely a low point in the path, rather than a continued downhill direction of the path itself.

Question. Recently, we were talking with British author Barbara Ward while she was in this country. She felt very strongly that it is in the power of the United States to control this situation, regardless of how France reacts. Our challenge, she stressed, is to resist our own inclinations to move back toward isolation. If we overreact to the sensitivities of the Europeans then we merely confirm what they are saying right now—but what they might not believe.

Answer. That is precisely correct, and this reaction works both ways unfortunately. For instance, remember the reaction by the press and public in the United States to General de Gaulle's statement of last January 14 about two items of particular interest to the Atlantic community; the organization of nuclear power and the British relationship to the Common Market. If we had accepted that interpretation, and I stress interpretation as being final, we would have raised a tremendous wall between us, driving the Europeans back into themselves, and returning to isolationism ourselves. It would have been inevitable.

Patience has to assume a primary position on both sides. In the past I have seen Europeans bite their fingernails up to the elbows, and I have seen Americans do the same thing. I would not try to decide which one is the pot and which one is the kettle. Both have a responsibility to show tolerance and understanding. But somehow, when the danger is less imminent than normal, we believe that we can indulge in the luxury of becoming sensitive to one another.

However, it should not take long to smooth out our differences. I would not be surprised to see a favorable turn in 6 months. But I would be very surprised, on the other hand, if we had made no substantial progress 18 months from now.

Question. Is there much substance to the fear that General de Gaulle, if he were able to maintain his own separate European force, would become a middle ground between the United States and the Soviet Union?

Answer. In Europe there is always present the "third force" concept—not only in France but in other countries as well. If there is some difficulty in the alliance, there always seems to be a tendency for some country to say they can do the job themselves. Right now, the Europeans' newfound feeling of strength is beginning to make some of them think they are the dynamic, balancing force which can keep things in line between the United States and the Soviet Union.

This thought does not represent the bulk of influential opinion in Europe today, but it is becoming more pronounced than it was. Most of the influential opinion does not favor this bloc system concept—the American bloc, the European bloc, and so forth. It is something out of the last century; it wasn't useful then, and it isn't now.

The smaller countries especially favor the overall Atlantic community approach, now that they have had a taste of working together within the alliance. They feel that if they were absorbed in a bloc of six, seven, or eight European nations, they would lose their individuality. They like the idea of being equals as they are within NATO.

Question: In the future, what problems do you foresee from a change of government in some of our key NATO partners? First, what would a Germany without Adenauer mean to the alliance?

Answer. Adenauer has been the leader of the government which has led the Federal Republic into the alliance and which has cast Germany as a respected member of the European family. No one could have been more ardent or more effective in his support for a united Europe, for NATO, and for Germany as part of the larger whole than Adenauer has been. I think we all owe him a tremendous debt.

As far as policy is concerned, I don't see any change. The only question is the effectiveness of his successor. I would not want to compare anyone with the "Old Man," because he is so unique. But I am firmly convinced that his successor Ludwig Erhard or whoever he may be will effectively support Germany's position within the alliance along the same general patterns established by Adenauer.

Question. What about France without De Gaulle? What would this mean to the alliance?

Answer. I don't think we can, or should, speculate on this possibility, because De Gaulle is going to have about 3 or 4 years more to run in France. He has demonstrated that he is a wonderfully strong man, so I feel that we should think in terms of France with De Gaulle rather than speculating about a France without De Gaulle.

Don't forget, De Gaulle has done a great deal for France. At the moment he has caused some uneasiness which has contributed to the situation which exists right now. But on the other hand, we should recognize that he has given great strength to France, and this in turn has contributed great strength to the alliance. So there are pluses and minuses here, and we have to look at both sides.

Question. What will a change of government in Britain means to the alliance?

Answer. Here again, I hesitate to speculate. We must remember that the Labor Party was in power when NATO was created, and that its Prime Minister was a real force and personality in helping to get the Allies together. There are some differences on defense matters between the Labor Party and the Conservatives, but on the overall question of NATO, I think both parties fully support the alliance.

Question. A number of observers have been saying that communism as preached by Marx and Lenin is running out of steam, and therefore, Khrushchev is more dedicated to the pursuit of Russian nationalism than international communism. Those analysts reason that if this is the case, then communism is no longer the danger that it used to be. Do you subscribe to this?

Answer. Well, I subscribe to it up to the point where it is said there is no longer the danger. Although communism as a militant ideology, and as a religion, is losing some of its appeal, we must remember that the Soviet leaders are products of the Marxist-Leninist system. They have been trained in it, they have been fighting for it, and under it, for 30 or 40 years. And for this reason alone it would not be wise to believe that the situation is becoming less dangerous. Perhaps it is growing less dangerous, but it would be disastrous for us to believe that it is less dangerous.

Question. Wouldn't it be a smart maneuver if Khrushchev were to conduct perhaps a 3-year peace offensive, including the teardown of the Berlin Wall, increased cultural exchanges, and other peace projects to make us relax our guard—all without weakening his military and technological capability to wage war against us a few years from now?

Answer. Certainly. I don't think he will do this, but it is an interesting idea on which to speculate. For instance, what if he reached a number of agreements with the West in such areas as Cuba and Berlin, and actually pulled back his forces? In the first place he would have an opportunity to pour money and effort into his own internal economy—and that is what he needs to do right now. Secondly, he would receive tremendous credit and acclaim in terms of world opinion for taking these steps toward peace.

But perhaps most important, he would have tempted us to relax our guard militarily. Then, 5 or 6 years from now when his economy is strong and growing, and when we have relaxed our guard, he might be able to do as he pleased in the world. As I say, I don't think this will happen, but it is interesting to speculate on the possibility.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR IMPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, some growers—less than 1 percent of the farmers of the United States—have benefited so long from the cheap labor provided by Public Law 78, or the Mexican farm labor importation program, that they cannot possibly conceive being without this program.

On May 29, 1963, a majority of House rightfully decided to end Public Law 78, which has for a dozen years depressed wages and working conditions and limited job opportunities of U.S. farmwork-

ers. Yet almost immediately a plea was made by some Members that the House reconsider its action and pass a 1-year extension.

But that call for a 1-year extension pleased the bracero-using growers as little as it did those of us who oppose Public Law 78. These growers want a permanent supply of cheap, docile labor, which can be easily exploited. If they cannot get it permanently, they want it as long as possible.

Therefore, on June 24, 1963, the House was treated to a new type of Public Law 78 extension bill. This was a measure to extend the program not for 1 year, not for 2 years, but for 3 years.

Even those Members who had previously taken the floor to plead for a 1-year extension and to introduce a 1-year bill after the defeat of H.R. 5497 now introduced the 3-year extension bill.

Of course, the 3-year bill is cleverly worded. It is called a "phase out" bill. But as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] told the House on June 26, the measure is so loaded with gimmicks that it really maximizes the number of braceros who would be admitted over the next 3 years under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, no one is fooled by the 3-year extension bill or the 1-year bill. The opponents of Public Law 78 both in and out of Congress will fight any extension of the program whatsoever.

We insist that the growers recruit their employees from among the hundreds of thousands of unemployed farmworkers from our own country. Unfortunately, the bracero-using growers believe they need not do that. They are almost violently opposing a bill in the other body which would recruit U.S. farmworkers for work on any farm which would need and want them.

The bracero-using growers are kidding themselves if they believe they can force Congress to forget the unemployed of this Nation and to reinstate Public Law 78.

The opponents of Public Law 78 are vigilant and are ready to do battle again—if that should be necessary. For example, only on June 19, 1963, the executive committee of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, a group of distinguished Catholic clergymen and lay leaders, adopted a strong resolution on this subject.

The NCRLC Executive Committee said, in part:

> Even though the House has once refused to extend the bracero program under Public Law 78, efforts are even now underway in both the House and the Senate to revive the program. We must emphatically urge Congress to reject these efforts.

If the bracero-using growers are truly concerned about a possible shortage of labor—and I doubt whether they are—then I would suggest that they support the legislation to provide the recruitment of unemployed U.S. farmworkers instead of strongly opposing this legislation, as they are now doing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of policy concerning Public Law 78 which was approved by the executive committee of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference on June 19, 1963.

EXCERPTS FROM THE STATEMENT OF POLICY ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE, JUNE 19, 1963

Even though the House has once refused to extend the bracero program under Public Law 78, efforts are even now underway in both the House and Senate to revive the program. We most emphatically urge Congress to reject these efforts and urge that all citizens communicate with their Senators and Representatives their insistence that Public Law 78 not be reinstated. At a time when countless and increasing numbers of our own citizens cannot find farm jobs, or any jobs, few and far between, when the average migrant finds less than 130 days of work a year for a yearly income of less than $1,000. it would be simply intolerable that we should continue to import masses of directly competing workers from Mexico.

We urge, moreover, that the appropriate departments of Government close up the gaping loopholes in Public Law 414 which employers have been exploiting to bring in tens of thousands of Mexicans as immigrants and commuters.

We wish to make it as clear as possible that we do not intend or consider such steps as being antibracero or anti-Mexican. We have a deep and active concern over the almost incredible poverty of many of our Mexican neighbors, but we insist that assistance to them should not be at the cost of the poorest of our own citizens. We urge rather that through our foreign aid program, and particularly through the Alliance for Progress, a more direct and effective attack be made on the causes of poverty in Mexico. We recommend generous and continued expenditure on a scale appropriate to Mexico's needs and capacity. Only thus will be eased the pressure of abject poverty that drives so many Mexicans to seek relief on this side of the border.

NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE REOPENING BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak of a measure long overdue to give veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces a second chance to buy national service life insurance. This is the insurance Uncle Sam made available to our World War II and Korean war GI's as a partial reward for the sacrifices those men and women made for the love of their country.

Rather abruptly, the privilege of purchasing this insurance was taken away from the Nation's fighting men. It was a harsh thing to do and it was not at all appreciated by the ex-GI's. I know, I am one of them.

The privilege of purchasing the comparatively inexpensive national service life insurance was revoked from World War II veterans only 6 years after the close of hostilities—compared to 33 years for World War I veterans. Korean veterans had even a shorter length of time—120 days from their separation from service.

Those veterans who had not had the farsightedness and the money to get their NSLI policies when they were available were left at the mercy of the commercial insurance market whose premiums were naturally much higher, or they were to take that calculated no insurance gamble.

Of course, it is easy to look back now with the wisdom of hindsight and say those GI's should have known better and taken the insurance when it was available, that it is their tough luck. But, as one of those GI's, I know how easy it was not to have known better. And, after all, are we so callous in this country that we punish someone forever for a long passed, single mistake?

Is it not a small price to pay to the dedicated men and women who preserved our Nation in time of war to permit them to preserve their own security in time of peace?

The proposal I support today is nothing new or revolutionary. It has been sent to the House of Representatives, after passage in the other body, eight times. Eight times it has passed the Senate, only to fail of congressional enactment because of inaction by the House of Representatives.

This is an injustice which, no matter how late the hour, must be righted—by House approval of a bill which has been returned here from the Senate with the NSLI reopening proposal attached as an amendment. That bill, H.R. 220, is lying at this moment on the Speaker's desk, waiting to be called up. It is a bill which, as it unanimously passed the House earlier this year, calls for the conversion of term NSLI policies with ever-increasing premiums to modified life contracts with level premiums after age 50 and reduced value at age 65.

The House-passed bill poses no problem. It offers no controversy. And I wonder how much real controversy is offered by the Senate-approved NSLI reopening amendment. Such a proposal has never been controversial in the Senate where it has swept through eight times. And I contend that it would pass the House by an overwhelming vote, too, if permitted to be freely debated and to be voted upon.

It is a measure that costs the taxpayer nothing, that is supported by the Veterans' Administration, that has won the strong backing of every major veterans organization in the country, and that would be of inestimable benefit to 16 million across the land who could take advantage of it.

With all this in mind, I urge passage by the House of this bill to make available for 1 year national service life insurance to those who were once eligible for it.

NLRB AND CONGRESSIONAL INTENT: PART II

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1962, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] took to the floor and made an attack on the National Labor Relations Board—as an institution of 25 years standing—on the Supreme Court decisions involving the National Labor Relations Act, and upon the NLRB members, both past and present. A handful of decisions—some by the Supreme Court—were cited to support the asserted proposition that the incumbent Labor Board members by tortured interpretations, ingenious innovations, and nimble footwork had all but gutted, had eroded and all but repealed, key provisions of the Labor Act. These were serious charges.

Mr. Speaker, last year's attack did not go unanswered. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], one of the leading participants in framing the conference report of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and a longtime valued member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, felt compelled to make a few remarks so that the comments of his friends, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], would not be considered the last word by Congress on the disputed and controversial issues then nearing court review. He disputed the nunc pro tunc interpretation of the law sought by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]; and he disagreed with the conclusion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] that the Labor Board was frustrating and circumventing the intent of Congress by its then current decisions.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], who then had recently chaired a subcommittee through a long, thorough, and painstaking investigation of the NLRB administration of the National Labor Relations Act, agreed with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] had attempted to "impose retroactively upon the statute" the interpretation they had been unable to write into the statute when the amendments were pending business. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] took the handful of cases relied upon by the gentleman from Michigan and put them in a larger context, a context of all the pertinent decisions issued by the Labor Board during the appropriate time span. Mr. PUCINSKI concluded from a study of all the Board decisions that the Labor Board is "doing an outstanding job of fairly administering the labor laws of this country. It is not a promanagement board; it is not a prolabor Board; it is a pro-American Board. It is calling the shots as it sees them, based on the merits of each individual issue as it arises."

The gentleman from California, Mr. Miller, a former employee of the Labor Board and a valued Member of the House whose tragic death last fall was a great loss to the country, joined his voice with that of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] to protest the assertion that—

> There is reason to wonder whether the NLRB * * * even concedes the constitutional authority of Congress to formulate and establish policy in the labor-management field.

From his unique vantage point as a former employee of the agency under attack, as one who could speak with first hand information and personal observation, as one who had no ax to grind, Mr. Miller commented that—

> In the literally hundreds of Board employees whom I have known and have done business with and trafficked with, I have found the highest degree of intelligence, the highest degree of effort and devotion to do right by their Government, to do right by the agency they represent, to do right by the general public, labor, and management. We employees of the Board yield to no one in the respect we have shown for this law, whether it was the Wagner Act of 1935, the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, or the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. We have done the best we possibly could under any and all of the laws, enforcing them to the best of our knowledge and ability.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], Mr. Miller, and I did not take exception to the fact that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] were disappointed in the results of some decisions of the Labor Board. This is to be expected. As the gentleman from Georgia told us then, the area of labor relations "is a complicated field, highly charged with emotion and closely linked with the public welfare." We only asked that these gentlemen present their grievances through the orderly and legitimate channels where charges can be answered, where a seasoned judgment can be assured on the basis of full facts after bipartisan review with a minimum of individual hit-and-run sniping. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] then assured us that he had suggestions for improvements, and briefly outlined some of them. His primary suggestion was that the Labor Board be deprived of jurisdiction over unfair labor practice cases and that this function be assigned to the various Federal District Court judges the country over. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] gave an immediate response: That this "would result in a patchwork quilt national labor policy with different interpretations and different standards of labor management relations in each of the geographical areas served by the more than 100 Federal district courts." I requested that these suggestions be presented to the appropriate body for study so we would have an opportunity to go into them more fully.

Mr. Speaker, months went by, 14 of them, Congress adjourned, Congress resumed its sessions, numerous bills have been proposed, and neither the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] nor the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] have referred any of their suggested reforms of last year to the appropriate committee for examination and study. Instead, on June 18, 1963, the gentlemen repeated their last year's performance.

We are told once again that the Labor Board is "politically oriented"; that it "wriggles adroitly through loopholes" of its own making; that its rulings are "extreme and tortured"; and to cap it all, that "the 25-year performance record of the National Labor Relations Board in the discharge of its judicial role represents one of the most lamentable episodes in the history of American jurisprudence."

The attack runs a wide gamut: from a complaint that the statute requires reviewing courts to accept agency findings of fact if supported by "substantial evidence," to a complaint that the independent general counsel follows prior rulings of the Labor Board "in situations where the facts are similar."

The attack is inconsistent. The gentlemen from Georgia and Michigan tell us that judicial review is not effective because the poverty of some litigants prevents their seeking review; and they suggest that the Labor Board adjudicatory functions—which are free—be abolished and that all litigants be required to pursue their rights—at their own expense—in the Federal district courts. The gentlemen complain because the Labor Board does not always accept a ruling by an individual court of appeals as final; and also complain because the Labor Board rejected a self-initiated doctrine—the Washington Coca-Cola doctrine—when it had been reversed by three courts of appeals on five different occasions.

The evidence to support the attack consists of the same handful of cases brought to our attention last year—slightly warmed over with a few, a very few, additions. The suggestions for change are those discussed very briefly 14 months ago on the floor of the House, but never submitted to the appropriate committee for critical analysis and debate.

I say, as I said last year, that the gentlemen from Georgia and Michigan are fully entitled to differ from my views—and the views of the reviewing courts—on the crucial and controversial issues raised in the difficult labor-management relations problems which constantly beset the Labor Board. But I ask again that these differences be resolved in the contemplative chambers of the appropriate committee, where charges can be answered, where facts can supplant fancy; and conversely, that the gentlemen refrain from any further hip-shooting charges on the privileged floor of this Chamber.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I have some comments to make. I may say it is my understanding that the gentleman's office notified the offices of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Georgia that we would discuss this matter today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] that any disagreement with court interpretations of the Labor Act—for the Board doctrine complained of has largely been approved by the different courts of appeals—should be referred to the appropriate committee for study. I note that my friend from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] has promised to introduce a bill calling for his suggested remedies, and I trust that he follows this course rather than again, for a third time, stage a carefully planned public attack on those who administer one of our most controversial laws.

Last year I examined the decisions criticized and described them, as I still do, as "thoughtful, carefully reasoned and demonstrative of a clear purpose to carry out the language of the act and the intent of Congress." The decisions, or the doctrines therein announced, were then approaching initial court review, and I wanted to make it clear that the comments of my friends, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], were not to be considered the last word by Congress on disputed and controversial issues.

Now, some of the decisions approach Supreme Court review, and I would like briefly to summarize what is before us.

Omitted by my colleagues from this year's discussion are the Labor Board's hot cargo decisions and the Board's lockout decisions, possibly because, judged on their—I suggest—inappropriate yardsticks, these decisions would fall on the promanagement side of the ledger. My friends, however, did reiterate last year's summation of cases in the areas of secondary boycott, blackmail picketing, and free speech, and included one new area of discussion; that is, the Labor Board's decisions that management must consult with labor prior to closing down an operation or contracting out work. Their selection this year, like their selection last year, meets neither the requirement of exhaustive review nor even the rudimentary requirements of a random sample.

I do not intend to repeat my last year's comments on the cases then discussed. A few comments, however, are warranted by recent developments.

THE SECTION 8(b)(4) SECONDARY BOYCOTT CASES

The section 8(b)(4) secondary boycott decisions involve extremely complicated and technical problems because section 8(b)(4) was a compromise piece of legislation with proviso added to proviso, and exception piled upon exception. Let me make brief mention here of the four so-called loopholes described by my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

First. The alleged "ambulatory picketing" loophole which was assertedly created when the Board abandoned its Washington Coca-Cola doctrine came only after the Labor Board was told on five different occasions by three separate courts of appeals that it was misconstruing our law.

Second. The alleged "reserve gate loophole"; that is, that it is lawful for striking employees to picket the gate used by the railroad cars making deliveries to the struck employer, followed close on the heels of a Supreme Court decision pointing to this result. Local 761, *IUE* v. *NLRB*, 366 U.S. 667. When the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit—by divided vote—recently reversed the Labor Board for following this holding, the Supreme Court promptly agreed to review the case, NLRB against Carrier Corp.

Third. The alleged loophole that was assertedly created when the Labor Board drew a practical distinction between high- and low-level supervisory personnel in the *Carolina Lumber* decision (130 NLRB No. 148) was initially approved by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit—*NLRB* v. *Local 294, Int. Brotherhood of Teamsters*, 298 F. 2d 105, 2d. Cir. 1961—and when the ninth circuit recently disagreed with the Board and with the second circuit on this matter, the Supreme Court promptly agreed to grant review—*Servette, Inc.* v. *NLRB*, 310 F. 2d 659 (9th Cir. 1962).

Fourth. The fourth and final asserted loophole resulted when the Labor Board held that a wholesaler is a "producer of a product" within the meaning of the so-called publicity proviso of the secondary boycott section, *Lohman Bros.*, 132 NLRB No. 67. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit disagreed with the Labor Board on this point, but the Supreme Court has agreed to resolve this problem—*Servette, Inc.* v. *NLRB*, 310, F. 2d 659.

THE SECTION 8(b)(7) "BLACKMAIL PICKETING" CASES

Suffice it to say here that to the degree that the doctrines in the Labor Board decisions attacked by my friends have been tested in the courts, they have either been sustained or, where not sustained, have been found to merit Supreme Court review.

Section 8(b)(7) makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to picket an employer where its object thereof is forcing or requiring an employer to "recognize or bargain" with the picketing union. The Labor Board has held that picketing to protest substantial departure from "area standards" is permissible, *Houston Building Trades*, 136 NLRB No. 28; that picketing to protest the discharge of an employee for union activities or other employer unfair labor practices is permissible, *Bachman Furniture*, 134 NLRB No. 54; on the theory that this type of picketing does not have the forbidden object of forcing or requiring an employer to "recognize or bargain" with the picketing union. My friends from Georgia and Michigan tell us that this is wrong; but the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit tells us that this is correct—*N.L.R.B.* v. *Local 3, IBEW*, F. 2d 53 LRRM 2116 (2d Cir. 1963) (Picoult Contracting).

Section 8(b)(7)(c) requires unions that picket for the object of obtaining recognition to file a petition for an election within 30 days so that the question of majority status can be determined without damage to outsiders. The Labor Board ruled that a picketing union which represents a majority of the employees need not file an election petition if it files seemingly valid "refusal to bargain" charges against the employer, because first, an election in the face of employer unfair labor practices will not reflect the uninhibited desires of the employees, and because second, the refusal to bargain charges and the election petition result in the same determination: the majority status of the union claiming recognition, *C. A. Blinne*, 135 NLRB No. 121. My friends from Georgia and Michigan, both now and last year, tell us this is wrong. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit tells us this is correct, *N.L.R.B.* v. *Local 182, IBT*, 314 F. 2d 53 (2d Cir. 1963).

Section 8(b)(7)(c) has a so-called publicity proviso which permits a union to picket "for the purpose of truthfully advising the public—including consumers—that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with, a labor organization." The Labor Board held that this quoted "publicity proviso" protects picketing even when the picketing has the object of compelling employer "recognition," *Crown Cafeteria*, 135 NLRB No. 124. My friends tell us this is wrong, the court of appeals tells us this is correct—*N.L.R.B.* v. *Local 182, IBT*, 314 F. 2d 53 (2d Cir. 1963) (Woodward Motors).

I might say parenthetically, as a member of the conference committee, if my recollection is correct, and I believe it to be, that I was the author of the particular proviso which the gentlemen say is being improperly interpreted and which I say is being properly interpreted. As a matter of legislative history I think this is worthy of some note.

Section 8(b)(7)(c) limits the "publicity picketing" discussed above. Such picketing cannot continue if an effect of such picketing "is to induce any individual employed by any other person in the course of his employment, not to pick up, deliver or transport any goods or not to perform any services." The Labor Board ruled that it is not any incidental refusal to work which will deprive the union of its right to engage in "publicity picketing," for that would put the rights to picket at the mercy of any "strong-willed deliveryman with an antipathy to crossing any picket line," *Barker Bros. Corp.*, 138 NLRB No. 54. My friends single out this decision, as they have the others mentioned above, as wrong.

They failed to tell us that this Labor Board doctrine was enunciated in prior decisions by Judge Skelly Wright and others on the Federal judiciary: *LeBus* v. *Building Trades Council*, 199 F. Supp. 628; *McLeod* v. *Chefs, Cooks, etc., Local*

89, 280 F. 2d 760; *Graham* v. *Retail Clerks International Association, Local No. 57*, 188 F. Supp. 847.

In short, my friends from Georgia and Michigan are attacking not only Labor Board decisions as wrong, but Labor Board doctrine approved by the reviewing courts as wrong.

Omitted from their list, of course, are the numerous decisions where the Board has found that union picketing violated section 8(b)(7) and which demonstrate that it has given validity to and has not "eroded" or "gutted" the protections Congress set up for employers against unlawful picketing.

Our friends from Georgia and Michigan cite four decisions to prove that the Labor Board "tinkers with" the right of free speech guaranteed in section 8(c) of the act. That section provides that the expression of any views, argument, opinion, and so forth, of a noncoercive nature shall not constitute or be evidence of "an unfair labor practice." There, by its terms, section 8(c) is applicable only to "unfair labor practice" cases; and three of the four cases cited by my friends involved not "unfair labor practice" cases at all; they involved "representation" cases—a very important distinction—wherein the Labor Board followed its long traditional policy of setting aside the results of an election when the victorious party engaged in coercion, trickery, or misrepresentation which "may reasonably be expected to have a significant impact on the election."

I note that the three cases cited by my friends involve situations wherein the Labor Board set aside the results of elections in which the unions were defeated following employer misrepresentations. Our friends could equally have cited cases wherein the Labor Board set aside the results of elections in which the union was victorious following union misrepresentations. See, for example, *Hollywood Ceramics Company, Inc.*, 140 NLRB No. 36 (1962). The policy of policing electioneering conduct is a two-edged blade which cuts against both management and unions in an effort to insure a reasoned vote and a free choice by employees in the selection of a bargaining agent; and the Labor Board uses this blade without discrimination to protect the employees' rights to representation of their own choosing.

The fourth case cited by my friends does involve an unfair labor practice case. The reviewing court disagreed with the Labor Board's holding that there was a "threat" of loss of employment when the employer told his workers that customers would terminate their business if the company became unionized—*Union Carbide Corporation* v. *N.L.R.B.*, 310 F. 2d 844 (6th Cir. 1962). However, one may feel about the merits of this decision, it is clear that the disagreement between Board and reviewing court involved not doctrine or philosophy, but the application of fact; and it is noteworthy that in an earlier case involving a similar factual situation, the Board was reversed by a different reviewing court for reaching the result the court in Union Carbide would require—*IUE* v. *N.L.R.B. (Neco Electric Products Co.)*, 289 F. 2d 757 (C.A. D.C., 1960).

Our friends from Georgia and Michigan speak this year of a new bogey, a series of decisions which we are told "pose a serious threat to the free enterprise system itself as well as to the institution of collective bargaining." This is pretty serious business.

These decisions require that an employer, prior to relocating his plant, prior to contracting his normal workload to outsiders, prior to going out of business for economic reasons, must inform and discuss the matter with the union.

Section 8(d) of our labor law requires management and labor to bargain collectively concerning "wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment." The Labor Board has held that a management decision to shut down a department, or a division, or a whole plant, does effect the "conditions of employment" under the law of those who will lose their jobs as a result of this management decision.

This makes sense to me, and it made sense to the court of appeals which reviewed and approved the initial decision in this area—*Town & Country Manufacturing Company* v. *N.L.R.B.*, F. 2d (5th Cir. 1963), 53 LRRM 2054. It also made sense to the Supreme Court when it construed the similar provisions of the Railway Labor Act as requiring a railroad to negotiate with the union as is going on right now, prior to discontinuing a service performed by employees in that union.—*Railroad Telegraphers* v. *Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company*, 362 U.S. 330.

That is the very essence of the great argument now proceeding. I am sure it makes sense to the numerous employers who regretfully inform a union that business conditions require the termination of a long-time operation and find that the union is willing to make concessions, and even loans, to tide the employer over a rough period.

My friends from Georgia and Michigan tell us that these decisions—that the employer must inform the union of his decision and discuss union counterproposals—require the employer "surrender of * * * basic, fundamental management prerogatives." My friends forget that neither the statute, the Labor Board decisions, or the approving court opinions require anything more than discussion, and this only until impasse is reached. Unions have no veto power, only an opportunity to assist their employer in facing economic hardships which fall equally upon all concerned with the company's continued prosperity.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If I might make a comment at this point. I am in complete agreement with you with regard to the wisdom of this discussion with the employees when adverse business conditions might require a move or going out of business because I think it sometimes produces mutually beneficial results. They have a mutual stake after all. An example has occurred just recently in my own State of Michigan. The Gibson Refrigerator Division of Hupp Corp. operates in Greenville and Belding, Mich. They felt they were facing economic hard times and might have to move their operation or close it down. They discussed this with the union and on the 3d day of June of this year, just a little over a month ago, they entered an agreement which succeeded in keeping this operation alive and keeping it in Belding and in Greenville, Mich.

Their agreement provided that the company would not make a move prior to November 2, 1965. In the event of any move after that date, 6 months' notice would be given to the union. The union in return agreed to cooperate completely with the management in making certain improvements in production schedules and in improving good will between the employer and the employees, customers, the union, and the public.

This agreement was arrived at because the management did discuss their problem with the union and it is going to make a great deal of difference to this community, to these workers, and to the company. I think this is the kind of thing we ought to be attempting to effectuate, not prevent.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman.

The Michigan matter to which the gentleman refers is a very recent one. In my own congressional district at this moment I know of two such negotiations where the employer feels it would be to his economic advantage either to move or to go out of business unless certain agreements with respect to the operation of the company are made.

Under the law they consulted the union and, lo and behold, it was the union people who made a suggestion in one instance so constructive that it is now evident the company is not only going to stay in business but is going to stay in business largely because of the financial resources of the union, loaned to it, to retool and to make other necessary changes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for yielding this time to me, and I shall be brief in concluding.

Whether it is the issue free speech, or conditions of employment, the real objection of my friends from Georgia and Michigan seems to be that the Labor Board decisions have almost without exception received the imprint of Court approval. I conclude, as I did last year:

> If we are dissatisfied with the way in which the courts construe our statute, the proper procedure is to amend the statute, not to attack the Labor Board whose decisions, if erroneous, can be corrected by judicial review.
>
> We should keep ourselves informed of the developments at the Labor Board, as we keep ourselves informed of the developments at the other agencies. We should revise our labor act when the courts put their imprimatur on a Labor Board interpretation we did not or could not anticipate. Ours, subject to constitutional limitation of free speech, due process, and so forth, is the last word. I only request that it be constrained pending full, and bipartisan, study through our normal avenue of discussion.

And, in this instance, as I said at the outset, if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] feel that the

National Labor Relations Act is being misinterpreted, the proper recourse is the introduction of legislation to correct the specific misinterpretations and then refer them to the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman and on which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] serves.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] very much for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his contribution. His words are entitled to particular weight as he was one of the leading participants in framing the conference report of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and ranks high as a leading scholar in the area of labor-management relations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] some time ago through the chairmanship of a special ad hoc subcommittee studying NLRB administration of the National Labor Relations Act had a wonderful opportunity to go into these problems in some detail and the report that his ad hoc subcommittee made following his investigation of this material is one of the finest things that has ever been done in this field.

I would, therefore, appreciate having the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] enlighten us with respect to some of the matters that were brought up by our colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] about which the gentleman has certain knowledge gathered through his investigation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and I wish to congratulate him for taking this time to put in proper perspective the role the NLRB is today playing under the administration of its Chairman, Mr. Frank W. McCulloch.

Frankly, I am deeply perturbed by the broadside attacks made on the Labor Board by its critics both in and out of Congress. The suggestion made by my friends on the floor of Congress that we deprive the Board of its unfair labor practice jurisdiction and turn that business over to the Federal district courts is not a new suggestion. It was advanced by the chamber of commerce and by the National Association of Manufacturers when President Kennedy's reorganization plan for streamlining the NLRB was before Congress some 2 years ago. This suggestion epitomizes the basic dissatisfaction that some small groups of minority employers have manifested in various forms of flank attacks ever since the frontal attack on the constitutionality of the Wagner Act was rejected by the Supreme Court in 1937. The attacks will undoubtedly continue. But we need industrial democracy to keep our industrial output in high gear and our political democracy flourishing; and these attacks on the basic underlying principles of the 1935 Wagner Act will fail as have those that have come in the past.

I do not mean to indicate that there is not always room for improvement. Of course there is. We should never rest satisfied with the feeling that we have achieved the ultimate. As soon as we let down our guard to contemplate our laurels, we are undone. Constant scrutiny, eternal vigilance, of the labor management and other laws as they affect the ever-changing industrial scene is a must. I am pleased that President Kennedy recently appointed a Labor Management Advisory Committee provided for by the 1947 Taft-Hartley amendments. I am sure that this panel, as it advises the Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, and other similar committees will discover the need for improvements in the basic law, and in the procedures for administering the basic law. And I am sure that these needs will be presented in orderly fashion for proper study and debate. This is how it should be; this was the procedure followed by Congress some 2 years ago when it established the special committee which I had the honor to chair.

My committee made a study in depth of the NLRB administration of the Labor Act. We found fault. We made suggestions. I am happy to report that the NLRB has responded to these suggestions with earnestness and dispatch.

1. THE PROBLEM OF DELAY

The most serious and constant complaint brought to our attention and stressed in our report, was the delay by the Labor Board in deciding unfair labor practice cases. A charge initiating the case would drag on literally for 2 or even 3 years before the Labor Board issued its decision. This was completely unsatisfactory to the charging party, be it labor, management, or an individual. The new Board under Chairman McCulloch, and the Office of the General Counsel, made great strides in cutting this delay. Now, the average case is decided by the Labor Board within 8 or 9 months of the time that the charge is filed in the regional office. And I must point out that only a handful of the charges filed go to the Labor Board. About 85 to 90 percent of all charges are settled at the regional levels within an average of 45 days of filing. This record is achieved through the informal settlement processes of the man on the scene who understands the local problems.

This informal process of adjustment works, and works well. A Labor Board study by University of Pittsburgh Prof. Philip Ross shows that of all meritorious "refusal to bargain charges" filed in 1962, approximately 80 percent of them were settled informally at the regional level within a month or two of filing; and in at least three-quarters of these informal settlements, negotiations resumed, usually to the completion of a contract.

What would happen if the suggestion of my good friends were adopted and the approximate 14,000 "unfair labor practice" cases filed in fiscal 1962 were turned over to the district courts for adjudication?

First, there would be no opportunity for NLRB adjustment which disposes of 9 out of every 10 cases to the satisfaction of the parties. When cases are filed in court, lines become fixed, positions harden, and settlement becomes difficult. The 11,000 plus cases which are now informally adjusted would have to be litigated in court.

Second, the delay in achieving a decision would again make the ultimate result a pyrrhic victory to the employee discharged for union activity; to the employer beset by picket line intimidation. Now, as I have stressed, the overwhelming majority of charges are concluded at the local level within 45 days. The exceptional cases which go on appeal to the Labor Board are decided within a time period of approximately 275 days. What kind of time lag would we expect if the cases were required to be filed in the Federal district courts? We need not guess. We have the figures from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. In the industrial areas of this country where most of the unfair labor practice cases originate, it now takes from between 500 to over 1,000 days for a case to be decided in a Federal district court.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought you got 73 more judges. What happened to those 73 additional judges?

Mr. PUCINSKI. My distinguished colleague from Iowa knows that those judges could not fill the backlog because there is a great deal more activity in the Federal courts, and the gentleman from Iowa knows that.

In the southern district of New York—New York City—the median time intervals from filing of a complaint to judicial decision in civil cases is 35.6 months. In the eastern district of Pennsylvania—Philadelphia—it is 34.6 months. In the northern district of Illinois—Chicago—it is 23.7 months. In the northern district of Ohio—Cleveland—it is 20.1 months. In the northern district of California—San Francisco—it is 18 months, or 540 days. Compare this with the few Labor Board cases which go to the Labor Board for decision—275 days—and the bulk of the Labor Board cases which are decided within 45 days at the regional levels.

Finally, I would like to point out that the suggestion that we transfer the unfair labor practice litigation to the Federal district court judges, many of whom are completely inexperienced in labor-management relations and the complexities of the technical aspects of our labor law, would create out of our present national law a patchwork quilt of different labor laws depending not on the intent of Congress but upon the construction given that intent by the hundreds of different Federal trial judges who would rely upon the guidance of counsel who

themselves would differ in experience, wisdom, and partisan approach. Who, I may ask, would represent the public interest in these private law suits before a judge who must sandwich a labor case between admiralty, bankruptcy, tort, and the other cases which form the bulk of our present Federal jurisdictions?

The delay in processing unfair labor practice charges received the greatest attention of the 300 or so witnesses who testified before the subcommittee I chaired. But other problems were raised as well, and it became apparent that the Labor Board was not doing its best job in some of these respects.

2. THE PROBLEM OF UNIT DETERMINATIONS

One problem brought to our attention concerned the Board's fashioning of units. The Labor Board is required by section 9(b) of the statute to hold elections—upon appropriate petition—in that unit—be it employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof—which will "assure to employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act."

Witnesses told us, and we found upon the evidence, that especially in the retail store situation "the Labor Board in determining the unit appropriate for collective bargaining had in some instances given too much weight to the administrative unit as established by the employer; and has given too little weight to the problems of geography" et cetera. In one situation, apparently typical, the Labor Board has decided upon a "unit" which included 47 different stores, most of which were clustered around Chicago but some of which were located in Milwaukee, 90 miles north of Chicago, one of which was located in Galesburg, Ill., 190 miles south of Chicago. The Board found this tristate unit appropriate because it corresponded with the Employer's administrative division. *Father & Sons Shoe Stores*, 117 NLRB 1479. Factors of geographic separation, local autonomy, presence or lack of employee interchange between outlets, were ignored. Decisions such as this prompted our recommendation that "the Board apply more realistic standards in determining a bargaining unit". The Board has done so. In *Sav-On Drugs, Inc.*, 138 NLRB No. 61, a new approach was detected. There, all the factors ignored in the earlier decisions—geography, local autonomy in purchase and employment practices, interchange of employees, et cetera—were given consideration and the Board found that a single store in a chain of merchandising outlets, a store far removed from the others and operated independently, constituted a unit appropriate for collective bargaining.

The reappraisal of mechanical rules, blindly applied, has continued in other areas of the unit problem. The Board reexamined a 1944 ruling that the only appropriate unit in the insurance field could be either State or company wide, and held that a citywide unit also could be appropriate, depending upon the autonomous day-to-day operation of that office, the lack of interchange of agents between district offices, and certain other factors. *Quaker City Life Insurance Company*, 134 NLRB 960. This decision freed the unions in the insurance business from the necessity of organizing all agents in a given State at once; and resulted in a 10-percent increase in the membership of the unions—indication that the old unit determination had deprived the insurance agents of the "fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by" the Taft-Hartley Act as amended by Landrum-Griffin.

The Board's determination to exercise an informed discretion to the facts of each case, rather than to approach each case mechanically, is demonstrated in a series of other situations. Truckdrivers are no longer automatically included with a union of production and maintenance employees, nor are they automatically granted severance from a unit of production and maintenance employees upon request. It now depends upon the community of interest which exists between the truckdrivers and the production and maintenance workers. Job content, not the job label, is controlling. Compare *Kalamazoo Paper Box Corporation*, 136 NLRB No. 10—truckdrivers included with production and maintenance workers—with *Koester Bakery Co.*, 136 NLRB No. 100—bakery workers granted a unit of production and maintenance workers excluding truckdrivers. The similar per se rule which had been blindly applied to truckdrivers was also applied to so-called technical employees: they had automatically been excluded from a unit of production and maintenance workers if the issue was contested. Now, they are included or excluded by their community of interest, not by the label applied to their work. *The Sheffield Corporation*, 134 NLRB 1101. Similar flexibility exists up and down the line: we can no longer complain as we did in September of 1961 that the Labor Board should apply more realistic standards in the determination of bargaining units.

3. THE PROBLEM OF EFFECTIVE REMEDIES

The witnesses before our committee complained not only because the Labor Board remedy was so long delayed, but also because it was so inadequate. Typically, President Pollock, of the Textile Workers Union, commented that "the Taft-Hartley penalties are so light that employers regard them largely as business operating expenses." Witnesses further commented that the Labor Board was derelict in failing to utilize the provisions of section 10(j) which authorize —but do not require—the Board to seek temporary court injunction whenever meritorious charges are filed.

We gave serious thought to this problem, mindful that the names of Norris and La Guardia caution against court injunctions in labor disputes, and recommended that the "Labor Board give careful consideration to greater utilization to the 10(j) injunction in situations of flagrant and aggravated acts of picket line force and violence, the situations of repeated discharge of union adherents, the situations where employers or unions flagrantly refuse to bargain in good faith, and the situations wherein the employer threatens to intimidate his employees by closing the plant or shifting work to affiliated factories."

I am pleased to report that the Labor Board has taken our suggestion to heart. The most recent NLRB annual report informs us that the Labor Board initiated some 11 section 10(j) proceedings—there were only 48 such proceedings in the 15-year period from 1947 through 1960. Eight of these proceedings were aimed at employer unfair labor practices, two against union unfair labor practices, and one against unfair labor practices jointly committed by management and labor.

It is comforting to know that the Labor Board is now using the complete arsenal we in Congress put at its disposal. But it is apparent that the district courts through the use of injunctions cannot do the work of the NLRB. The Labor Board must devise its own remedies to make the Labor Act an effective vehicle for industrial peace. This it is doing.

I have commented on the processes of informal adjustment at the initial and local levels of the case processing. Over 2,000 cases are now quietly settled each year through this technique.

The Labor Board has also made its back pay order more effective by, first, requiring those responsible for the unlawful discharge of the employee—be it management, union, or both—to pay 6 percent interest—*Isis Plumbing & Heating Co.*, 138 NLRB No. 97; and, second, by discontinuing its former practice of abating liability for back pay in the event of an erroneous trial examiner decision against back pay, for the period from such decision until the Board corrects it—*A.P.W. Products Co.*, 137 NLRB No. 7. Both of these efforts to make Labor Board remedies more effective have received judicial approval by reviewing courts. *Reserve Supply Corporation* v. *NLRB*, F. 2d (2d Cir. 1963), 53 LRRM 2374; *NLRB* v. *A.P.W. Products*, F. 2d (2d Cir. 1963), 53 LRRM 2055.

The Labor Board has also made efforts to ensure that the right to select a bargaining representative and to engage in collective bargaining will not be thwarted by the multiplant corporation through the callous shutdown of those plants where the employees vote for union representation. Thus, in the *Darlington Mills* case, 139 NLRB No. 23, the facts showed the company did close a unionized plant to avoid its statutory obligations to bargain. The plant was closed, and sold. The Labor Board entered the picture too late to seek an injunction against the closing. Compare the Board's action in *Phillips* v. *Burlington Industries, Inc.*, 49 LRRM 2144 (N.D.N. Ga. 1962.) The remedy of reacquiring and reopening the plant was apparently thought too harsh. Compare the Board's order in *Town & Country Mfg. Co.*, 136 NLRB No. 111, approved on judicial review, *Town & Country Mfg. Co.* v. *NLRB*, F. 2d (5th Cir. 1963) 53 LRRM 2054. The Board's remedy in Darlington was an order that the employees discharged for their prounion vote to be offered jobs at other plants—with moving expenses; that their back pay be continued until they received comparable employment with the same company or elsewhere; and that the company recognize the union as the bargaining agent for the Darlington plant employees and bargain

with the union concerning the reemployment rights.

I think it is safe to assume that the Labor Board, slowly but surely, is seeking to fulfill our recommendations that it explore new remedies to effectuate the statutory mandate to encourage the practices and procedures of collective bargaining.

4. THE PROBLEMS OF FREE SPEECH AND RACE HATE

The problems of free speech with all their ramifications were brought to our attention. We received evidence about the harmful effects of the captive audience doctrine; about the arbitrary distinction drawn by the Labor Board between a threat, and an economic prediction; about the pressures brought upon the employees by outside community groups; and about the use of race-hate material to inflame the employees against unions and—sometimes—employers.

The Labor Board has moved in all these areas, but the problem I would like to emphasize concerns the use of race hate. Our subcommittee was frankly perplexed by this problem. We condemned the use of such propaganda in connection with labor-management disputes; but we recognized that the constitutional guarantee of free speech might protect such utterances. We recommended that the Labor Board provide an adequate opportunity for this matter to be resolved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Again, I am proud to report, the Labor Board responded kindly to our recommendation with a well-considered solution. The Board has recognized that "prejudice based on color is a powerful emotional force" and that "appeals to racial prejudice on matters unrelated to the election issue have no place in Board electoral campaigns." However, the Board also has recognized that a "relevant campaign statement may have racial overtones." Thus, the test announced was:

> So long, therefore, as a party limits itself to truthfully setting forth another party's position on matters of racial interest and does not deliberately seek to overstress and exacerbate racial feelings by irrelevant, inflammatory appeals, we shall not set aside an election on this ground. However, the burden will be on the party making use of a racial message to establish that it was truthful and germane, and where there is doubt as to whether the total conduct of such party is within the described bounds, the doubt will be resolved against him.

Applying this test, the Labor Board issued two decisions on the same day. In one, *Sewell Manufacturing Company*, 138 NLRB No. 12, the Board set aside the results of the election because the employer's propaganda "exceeded permissible limits and so inflamed and tainted the atmosphere in which the election was held that a reasoned basis for choosing or rejecting a bargaining representative was an impossibility." In the other case, *Allen-Morrison Sign Co., Inc.*, 138 NLRB No. 11, the Board refused to set aside the results of the election because the employer's racial propaganda was "temperate in tone, germane and correct factually."

This test, and its application, protects both the right of employees to vote in an atmosphere where the uninhibited desires of the voters may be determined, and the right of the participants to inform the voters of all relevant issues, including those concerning racial matters.

This solution, to me, represents the careful work of the Labor Board to effectuate the intent of Congress in this and the other troublesome areas of labor-management relations as they exist in today's America.

It has been stated recently here on the floor that the performance of the Labor Board "represents one of the most lamentable episodes in the history of American jurisprudence." I say that the performance of the Labor Board, as judged objectively by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, is heartwarming. In 1961–62, the Supreme Court decided five cases involving questions concerning the administration of the National Labor Relations Act; and sustained the Board's position in all of them. This year, 1962–63, the Supreme Court reviewed the administration of the National Labor Relations Act in four cases, and sustained the Board's position in three of them.

In short, the present Labor Board has been sustained in eight of the nine Supreme Court decisions, a batting average of almost 0.900. I would that the other agencies, or this Congress, would do so well.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that those who are quick to criticize the present National Labor Relations Board have missed their mark. This Board is merely trying to restore labor-management relations a good deal closer to national labor policy. What is the policy? It was laid down by the late distinguished gentleman from Ohio, co-author of the Taft-Hartley Act, when he stated in the preamble to that act that the working men and women of America should be encouraged to organize into unions for the purpose of collective bargaining. The previous Board too frequently ignored this national labor policy. This Board is merely trying to reestablish national labor policy as established by Congress. And, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States agrees with what the Board is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to also mention in closing that questions raised here recently during an attack on the Board that the new General Counsel may not be able to do a good job are without foundation. Arnold Ordman, the new General Counsel, has had 17 years of experience with the Board before his new assignment. President Kennedy could not have found a more experienced or more dedicated public servant than Arnold Ordman. I am confident he will be one of the most effective and impartial General Counsels in the history of the Board.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving us the benefit of his subcommittee's study of the Labor Board and his followup observations which prove the wisdom of such studies. I trust the proposed amendments promised by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] will be referred to a subcommittee for equally competent analysis so we can get on with the business begun with the Wagner Act of 1935—to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations and management, to prevent the interference with labor organizations and management, to prevent the interference by labor or management with each other's legitimate rights, and to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING LABOR BOARD DECISIONS RELIED UPON BY CONGRESSMEN LANDRUM AND GRIFFIN IN THEIR RECENT DISCUSSION OF THE LABOR BOARD

On April 10, 1962, Congressmen LANDRUM and GRIFFIN took to the floor of the House and cited a number of cases to support their conclusion that the Board was violating the intent of Congress. This discussion appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 5, pages 6190–6195.

The repeat performance was on June 18, 1963, and appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 11051–11059.

It is the purpose of this memorandum to describe the cases discussed by Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN on these two occasions.

A. THE SECONDARY BOYCOTT CASES

The *Carolina Lumber Company* case, 130 NLRB No. 148 (1961) and the *International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 324* case, 131 NLRB No. 228 (1961), involve the interpretation of section 8(b)(4). This section makes it unlawful for a union to induce or to "encourage any individual employed by any person" to engage in certain unilateral forbidden activities, or for a union to "threaten, coerce or restrain any person" in the same regard.

In the Carolina Lumber Company case, the Board reasoned that the statutory distinction between the prohibition against inducing individuals and coercing persons required the Board to decide whether supervisory personnel who had been "induced, but not threatened" were "individuals" or "persons." All participating Board members were in agreement.

In the *International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 324* case, the Board applied this Carolina Lumber decision and held that the job superintendent in complete charge of a building project was "more nearly related to the managerial level than to rank-and-file employees" and therefore was not an "individual," and hence, the union inducements did not violate the prohibitions of section 8(b)(4).

In the *Servette, Inc.* v *NLRB* case, 310 F. 2d 659, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed with the Labor Board's dichotomy between "persons" and "individuals," and the Supreme Court has agreed to review this issue.

The *Middle South Broadcasting Company* case, 133 NLRB No. 165 (1961), and the *Lohman Brothers* case, 132 NLRB No. 67 (1961), require interpretation of the so-called publicity proviso which permits a union to truthfully advise the public that "a product or products are produced by an employer with whom the labor organizations has a primary dispute and are distributed by another employer."

In Lohman Brothers, the Teamsters were on strike against a distributor and handbilled several drugstores to inform the public that the drugstores were distributing products produced by a "struck employer." The Labor Board held that a wholesaler "produces a product" within the intent of the statute and that therefore the handbilling was not unlawful.

In *Middle South Broadcasting Company*, 133 NLRB 1698, the union striking against a

radio station handbilled outside an automobile agency which advertised on the struck radio station, and the Board held that this handbilling was lawful on the theory that the radio station was producing a product distributed by the automobile agency.

In the *Great Western Broadcasting Corporation* case, 310 F. 2d. 591, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals rejected the Labor Board's view that a struck TV station "produces a product," and the Supreme Court has agreed to review the conflict.

The *Plauche Electric Company* case, 135 NLRB No. 41, and the *Houston Armored Car* case, 136 NLRB No. 9, concern the overruling of the Board's old Washington Coca-Cola doctrine. The problem in these cases involves so-called ambulatory picketing. In the *Washington Coca-Cola* case, 107 NLRB No. 299, the Labor Board had held that a union engages in "secondary" picketing when it follows the delivery trucks and pickets the trucks as they make deliveries to "neutral" establishments purchasing from the struck employer.

In *Plauche Electric,* 135 NLRB 250, the IBEW picketed a retail store where electrical work was being done by a struck employer. The application of the Washington Coca-Cola doctrine would have required a holding that this picketing was unlawful secondary action because the nonunion employees on the job spent a few minutes at the opening and closing of the work day at the electrical contractor's shop, and under Washington Coca-Cola, the striking employees were required to picket their employer's home establishment and no other location. In Plauche, the Board abandoned the Washington Coca-Cola doctrine and held that it was lawful for striking employees to picket the establishment where the "struck" work was substantially performed.

In the *Houston Armored Car Company* case, 136 NLRB 110, the Board applied its Plauche ruling and held that it was not unlawful for a striking union to follow their employer's armored cars and picket the cars as they stopped to pick up and deliver money.

The Carrier Corporation case, 132 NLRB 127, involved a situation where a railroad was making deliveries to a struck employer through a separate gate. The Labor Board held that the striking employees engaged in lawful, primary activity when they picketed this gate. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the Labor Board by a 2-to-1 vote and denied a rehearing en banc by a 5-to-4 vote, and the Supreme Court has agreed to review the case.

B. THE FREE SPEECH CASES

1. The 1962 discussion

In 1962 our friends discussed four cases, the May Company case, the Somismo, Inc., case, the Cole Manufacturing Company case, and the Worth Manufacturing Company case.

In the *May Company* case, 136 NLRB 797, the Labor Board ruled that a department store employer who enforced a no-solicitation rule and who gave an antiunion speech on company time violated the rights of the employees when he refused the union's request for equal time. The sixth circuit recently reversed the Board's decision on this point.

In the *Somismo, Inc.,* case 133 NLRB 1310, the Labor Board set aside the results of an election on the theory that the employer threatened to go out of business, when the employer told his employees in a captive audience meeting that "if by chance the union were to be voted into this shop * * *. Somismo will not be able to cope with that problem. * * *As it is now we have laid off a number of men already, and you all know it."

Cole Manufacturing Company, 133 NLRB 1455, was another election case where the Board set aside the results of an election on the theory that an employer's speech contained promises of benefit to the employees if the union lost the election. The employer had told the employees that after the union had lost an election conducted 2 years previously, the employer had received more contracts for work because customers had confidence in the company.

The *Worth Manufacturing Company* case, 134 NLRB 444, was decided by Members Rodgers, Fanning, and Brown, holding that an employer had restrained and coerced his employees by telling them during an organizational campaign that he would no longer borrow money to build inventories and keep his plant going because it seemed that the employees did not appreciate his past efforts.

2. The cases discussed in 1963

The *Dal Tex Optical Company* case, 137 NLRB No. 189, was an election case where the Board set aside the results because the employer's speeches on election eve contained threats and offers of benefit. In part, the employer told his employees (1) that he would fight the Board through the courts so that "if the union wins, it don't mean a thing"; (2) that "I have made it a practice of giving back in increased wages all efficiency gains during the year * * * do you want to gamble all of these things? If I am required by the court to bargain with this union, whenever that may be, I will bargain in good faith, but I will have to bargain on a coldblooded business basis. You may come out with a lot less than you have now. Why gamble because agitators make wild promises to you?" (3) "I am not afraid of a strike. It won't hurt the company. I will replace the strikers. They will lose all their benefits."

Plochman and Harrison Cherry Lane Foods, Inc., 140 NLRB No. 11, was another decision wherein the Board set aside the results of the election, this time because the employer had an election eve captive audience showing of a film, "And Women Must Weep." The purport of the film is, as the Board found, "that all unions are irresponsible organizations and that a vote for union representation is a vote for strikes, violence, and perhaps even murder."

Union Carbide Chemicals Company, 136 NLRB 95, was a case where the participating Board members (Leedom, Fanning, and Brown) held that the employer violated his employees' rights when during an organizing campaign the employer in a series of prepared speeches said:

"Customers are buying products on the basis of prices, delivery and dependability. * * * We have been told that we would not continue to be the sole source of supply if we become unionized due to the ever-present possibility of a work stoppage due to strikes or walkouts."

The court of appeals disagreed and found no coercion in the speech.

In *Oak Manufacturing Company,* 141 NLRB No. 121, the Board set aside the results of the election because two preelection campaign letters to the employees tended to engender so much fear of reprisal as to render impossible a rational, uncoerced decision by the employees. In part the employer said, "We can state categorically that the election of district 122 will not bring about any increase in your wages. In fact, the designation of district 122 as bargaining agent would give us strong argument for reducing wages, since district 122 ordinarily agrees to lower wages than you are already being paid. District 122 cannot and will not obtain any wage increase for you. * * * There is no such thing as taking a chance with a union. Once you have voted a union in, the union is virtually impossible to get rid of, and all the problems that unions can bring are yours. Unions have even been known to call long, bitter, and violent strikes for the apparent purpose of preventing employees from voting them out."

C. THE SECTION 8(b)(7) BLACKMAIL PICKETING CASES

1. The cases discussed in 1962

Calumet Contractors, 133 NLRB No. 512 (1961), was a case where the Board held that union picketing to protest substandard area employment practices did not violate the provisions of section 8(b)(4)(C), which prohibit picketing where an objective thereof is to force an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees.

Calumet Contractors more appropriately belongs under the section 8(b)(4) secondary boycott cases, as indicated above, but it was discussed in the context of section 8(b)(7) blackmail picketing cases by Mr. GRIFFIN.

The Board reasoned that the union objective of improving area standards could be achieved without the employer either bargaining with or recognizing the union.

In the *Houston Building and Construction Trades Council* case, 136 NLRB 321 (1962), the Board applied the Calumet Contractors finding to an 8(b)(7) situation, i.e., the Board held that "area standards" picketing does not necessarily fall within the prohibition of section 8(b)(7), which makes it unlawful for a union to picket an employer where an object thereof is forcing or requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization.

In *Bachman Furniture,* 134 NLRB 670, the Board similarly held that union picketing did not violate the prohibitions of section 8(b)(7) when the conceded purpose of the picketing was to "punish" the employer for his unfair labor practices in a situation where the union had ceased any interest in representing the employees of the picketed employer.

Here the truckdrivers for a department store asked the Teamsters Union to represent them. The union petitioned for an election and was defeated in the election when the employer gave an illegal 30-percent wage increase on election eve. Two years later, the truckdrivers again came to the union, the union again requested recognition, the employer again defeated the union in an NLRB election by an illegal 30-percent increase. The union thereupon picketed the department store with signs telling the story, "for the satisfaction in a labor-conscious community of letting people know" about Bachman's activities.

Blinne Construction Company, 135 NLRB 1153 (1962), involved the construction of section 8(b)(7)(C), which makes it unlawful for a union to picket an employer to obtain recognition for beyond a reasonable period not to exceed 30 days without petitioning for an NLRB election.

Here, the three common laborers joined the union, the union requested recognition, the employer fired all the employees and replaced them, and the union picketed for more than 30 days without petitioning for an election. The union contended that the so-called blackmail picketing prohibition was not intended to apply to picketing by "majority unions." The Board rejected this contention, holding that it is necessary for a majority union to file the election petition to protect itself from the prohibitions of the act.

The Board agreed, however, with the union that there is no need to file the petition for an election when there are outstanding unfair labor practice charges against the employer, charging him with refusal to bargain. The Board's theory was that the election and the refusal to bargain charges involve the self-same issues and that therefore the filing of one excuses the filing of the other.

Crown Cafeteria, 135 NLRB 1183 (1962), involved the construction of the so-called publicity proviso of section 8(b)(7)(C), i.e., the provision that "nothing in this subpara-

graph shall be construed to prohibit any picketing or other publicity for the purpose of truthfully advising the public (including consumers) that an employer does not employ members or have a contract with a labor organization." The Board held that "publicity picketing" was protected, even when the objective of the picketing was to force an employer to recognize or bargain with the picketing union. They read the act as authorizing publicity picketing only when the objective was not to require the employer to recognize or bargain with the picketing union.

2. The cases discussed in 1963

Barker Brothers Corporation and Golds, Inc., 138 NLRB 544 (1962) involved the interpretation of the limitation on the publicity proviso; i.e., that the publicity picketing can continue only until "an effect of such picketing is to induce any individual employed by any other person in the course of his employment not to pick up, deliver or transport any goods or not to perform any service." The Board held in Barker that it is not every isolated refusal to cross the picket line that can deprive the picketing union of its right to truthfully advise the public that their employer does not have a contract with the picketing union. The Board held that it is only when the picketing has "disrupted, interfered with, or curtailed the employer's business" that the publicity proviso loses its effectiveness.

Jay Jacobs Down Town, Inc., 140 NLRB 127, involved union picketing for recognition which took the form of truthfully advising the public that the employer did not have a contract with a union. Despite repeated efforts by the union to insure that deliveries would not be curtailed, there were a few isolated situations where they were curtailed. Applying the Crown and Barker Brothers decisions, the Board held that this picketing could not be enjoined.

D. THE SUBCONTRACTING CASES

These cases have to do with section 8(d) of the act, which requires employer and union to bargain collectively and in good faith "with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment."

In 1963, Messrs. LANDRUM and GRIFFIN discussed three cases in which they assert the Labor Board has extended the statutory term "other terms and conditions of employment" to the breaking point.

In *Fibreboard Paper Products Corp.*, 138 NLRB No. 67 (1962), the employer unilaterally subcontracted its maintenance work for economic reasons without first negotiating with the duly designated bargaining agent of its employees over its decision to do so. Relying upon its recent decision in *Town and Country Manufacturing Co.*, 136 NLRB No. 11, the Board held that the decision to subcontract work does concern "conditions of employment" within the statutory sense.

The *Renton News* case, 136 NLRB 1294 (1962), presents a similar situation, where the Board held that the employer newspaper violated the act by refusing to bargain with the union before it changed its methods of operation by contracting out its composition work and firing its own composing room employees.

In *American Manufacturing Co. of Texas*, 139 NLRB 57 (1962), the Board similarly held that the employer violated the bargaining requirements of the act when he closed down his trucking operations and had the work done by outside contractors.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution. He did a great deal of work on this subject, and I think the results he achieved and the continuing review he has been able to conduct of the faults that he found in NLRB procedures at the time of his investigation serves to reemphasize the validity of carefully considered and thorough committee investigations into problems of this nature. I wish to repeat my earlier invitation, that if those who criticize the conduct of the Board from the floor of the House have proposals to change what they believe is wrong, the thing for them to do is to introduce legislation on that subject, and the legislation will be referred to the appropriate committee and subcommittee where it will be considered by people who have the best interests of the country and of the Board at heart.

FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week Americans across the country will be observing Captive Nations Week. July 14 to 20 will be the fifth such observance. Since 1959, when the 86th Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, the activities of the annual observance have grown in scope and depth. From the President, the Governors of our States, and the mayors of our cities, proclamations are issued on the basis of the resolution, urging our citizens to devote themselves anew to the emancipation and freedom of all captive nations. Major cities such as New York, Chicago and Buffalo have made the week an official, citywide observance, and many others are following suit.

While Captive Nations Week has become a firm American institution, it has also been a huge bone in Khrushchev's throat. We cannot ever forget the vehement reaction on the part of the Russian dictator to Congress' passage of the resolution in July 1959. For months on end Khrushchev denounced and railed against Public Law 86–90. Every year Moscow and its puppets decry the observance and only this past January 23, the New Times, the Soviet Russian weekly, declared:

Is it not high time to discontinue the Captive Nations Week in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the Hungarian question.

There is nothing that Khrushchev desires more at this time than the complete acquiescence of the United States and the free world to the permanent captivity of the nations of central Europe, the U.S.S.R., and Asia. Captive Nations Week and all that each observance produces in thought and discussion regarding America's positive role in the cold war is a major impediment to Moscow's goal. The resolution itself is a permanent portrait—a mirror if you will—of the Soviet Russian colonial empire which Moscow and its puppets seek to conceal from the world at large.

I feel certain the American people will never acquiesce to Moscow's empire. Nor will they buy the currently peddled notion that for a dubious peace we must accommodate Khrushchev and his colonial empire. On the contrary, during this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, the American people will respond to the theme of the week: "Liberate Cuba—To Restore the Faith in All Captive Nations—To Win the Cold War." All the captive nations constitute a strategic weapon for us in the cold war. To foolishly ignore or neglect them would mean to discard this basic weapon to the manifest benefit of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans across the Nation prepare for this fifth observance, they would do well to read carefully again Public Law 86–90. I, therefore, request that the text of the Captive Nations Week resolution be printed after my remarks. I also ask that the following material prepared by the National Captive Nations Committee, which has guided the week's observances since 1959, be printed in the given order: "What You Can Do To Implement the Captive Nations Week Resolution, Public Law No. 86–90"; "Select Source Material From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on U.S. Captive Nations Week 1960–63"; "Kennedy Asked for Leadership in Fifth Captive Nations Week Observance"; "The Text of President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week Proclamation," issued July 5, 1963, following our own Independence Day; a message of praise sent to the President by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee; and a message to Members of Congress sent by the National Captive Nations Committee, pointing out the theme of the 1963 week and certain proposals for U.S. cold war strategy.

S.J. RES. 111

Joint resolution providing for the designation of the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human

freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

Approved July 17, 1959.

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO IMPLEMENT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION, PUBLIC LAW NO. 86–90

1. Obtain copies of Public Law No. 86–90 from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. (Single copies may be obtained from your Congressman.) Distribute to interested friends.

2. Form a local captive nations committee in your community composed of leaders in the fields of religion, business, colleges, and universities, civic and fraternal organizations, veterans groups, women's clubs, and of course your city and State officials.

3. Have your committee appoint members to subcommittees to handle specific functions and have these functions well defined to avoid duplication of effort (e.g., finance, speakers, publicity, advertising, rally, parade, church services, public displays in hotels and stores, civic-service-fraternal organizations, women's clubs, veterans groups, schools, youth groups, essay contest).

4. Brief all members of committee on Captive Nations Week resolution, past Presidential proclamations, 1963 week theme, scope of observance in your community.

5. Advise your Senator, Governor, and Congressman of your plans and progress and invite their attendance (as speakers if you desire).

6. Call on your Governor and mayor to issue State and local Captive Nations Week proclamations well ahead of the week (July 14–20, 1963).

7. Set date or dates for major highlights of week (rally, breakfast, dinner, etc.), select speaker or speakers desired, and issue invitations to selected speakers.

8. Decide on method of fundraising to support program and have finance committee immediately start fundraising program.

9. Have subcommittee on church services contact local churches, synagogues, and mosques requesting that one day of the week be dedicated to the captive nations with appropriate services and prayers.

10. Have publicity subcommittee send press releases, background material and suggested editorials to local newspapers and radio and television stations. Try to arrange for participation of committee members on local radio-TV programs.

11. Have publicity and advertising subcommittees plan and carry out effective program to ensure communitywide attendance at functions.

12. Upon the conclusion of the week's ceremonies, write a report on your activities and send it, together with clippings, releases, etc., to the National Captive Nations Committee, suite 107, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D.C., for inclusion in committee's national report. Your cooperation in this regard will be deeply appreciated.

SELECT SOURCE MATERIAL FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON U.S. CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960–63

(The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be obtained at your local library or by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.)

1. "The Captive Nations Week Resolution," volume 106, part 1, pages 1032–1037.
2. "Freedom," volume 106, part 13, pages 17674–17694.
3. "Captive Nations Week," volume 107, part 8, pages 10413–10421.
4. "Captive Nations Week Committee," volume 107, part 10, pages 13120–13122.
5. "Captive Nations Week, 1961," volume 107, part 10, pages 13168–13196.
6. "Proposal for * * * Captive Nations," volume 107, part 11, pages 14610–14620.
7. "Action on * * * Committee on Captive Nations," volume 107, part 11, pages 15376–15383.
8. "U.S. Government Policy and a Special Committee on Captive Nations," volume 107, part 13, pages 17619–17632.
9. "Captive Nations Week," volume 108, part 10, pages 13722–13744.
10. "Some Facts on the 1962 Captive Nations Week," volume 108, part 10, pages 14224–14228.
11. "The Enslaved Millions * * *," volume 108, part 11, pages 14671–14672.
12. "Captive Nations Week * * *," volume 108, part 11, pages 14798–14801.
13. "Captive Nations: The 1962 Week * * *," volume 108, part 14, pages 19505–19510.
14. "Reply to Khrushchev on Cuba," volume 108, part 15, pages 19971–19975.
15. "What is the Next Maneuver on a Special Committee on the Captive Nations?" March 28, 1963, pages 4976–4985.

KENNEDY ASKED FOR LEADERSHIP IN FIFTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 21.—President Kennedy was asked today to lead the Nation in the fifth Captive Nations Week observance by departing from "established procedure." In an appeal for an early Presidential proclamation and one stressing the need for popular study of all the captive nations, the National Captive Nations Committee held that the procedure of previous years has created the widespread impression that "our Government seeks to play down the week for fear of how Khrushchev and his puppets would react." Captive Nations Week falls on July 14–20.

Following up the appeals made for an early proclamation by several Senators and Congressmen, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the committee and professor of economics at Georgetown University, stated that an early proclamation would dispel this impression. Senators DOUGLAS, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KEATING, and LAUSCHE have received White House replies declaring that there are "no plans to depart from the established procedure this year." A similar reply was sent to Congressmen DERWINSKI, DULSKI, FLOOD, and STRATTON. The "established procedure," according to NCNC, "has meant a late Friday afternoon issuance (2 days before the week) and submerged by some chosen major news item."

The President was also urged to underwrite in the proclamation the need for popular study of all the captive nations in order to "advance immeasurably our country's interests in cold-war education." Dobriansky stated these "interests are not helped, for example, when our Secretary of State states the U.S.S.R. is 'a historical state,' and Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine are 'traditional parts' of this empire, followed by a sharp contradiction by our U.N. Ambassador." The Rusk views were expressed in August 1961 in a letter to Congress, in which he stated his reasons for believing that the Congress should not establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Stevenson's view was given in the U.N. in November 1961.

The NCNC appeal to the President also pointed out that "these vital interests are not served by the myth provided by one of your advisers for your recent American University address, wherein you stated that 'no nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Russians suffered in the course of the Second World War.'" Dobriansky observed that it is "a matter of scholarly record that the heaviest brunt of the Nazi invasion was suffered, both in lives and treasure, by the captive non-Russian nations of Byelorussia, Ukraine, Lithuania, Cossackia, and North Caucasia."

"Like the Irish," he said, "these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. will resist every misguided attempt to submerge their national identities and the truth of their sufferings under an imperialistic-colonial yoke." He added, "We cannot hope to win the cold war on the basis of anything but truth and well-founded action."

CAPTIVE NATIONS PROCLAMATION

The text of President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation, issued yesterday: "Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation, designating the third week in July 1959 as Captive Nations Week, and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world and

"Whereas the cause of human rights and dignity remains a universal aspiration and

"Whereas justice requires the elemental right of free choice and

"Whereas this Nation has an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom.

"Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 14, 1963, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed."

THE PRESIDENT,
Summer White House,
Hyannis Port, Mass.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your early proclamation of the 1963 Captive Nations Week draws our most enthusiastic praise and gratitude. I cannot thank you enough for your favorable response to our urgings over the past 2 months for an early proclamation. In comparison with previous ones, this proclamation we hail as being unique on two counts: (1) Its early issuance, inspiring Americans across the Nation to make this fifth observance the most meaningful yet; and (2) its stress on "the just aspirations of all people

for national independence and human liberty," which means the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., such as Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Turkestan, and others, as well as those in central Europe and Asia. Your proclamation unquestionably advances our peoples' understanding of Public Law 86–90.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee.

JULY 5, 1963.

DEAR FRIEND OF WORLD FREEDOM: During July 14–20 Americans across the Nation will celebrate the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week. We urge your joining them with an address on the occasion in Congress.

Provided by Public Law 86–90, the week has developed into a veritable institution symbolizing America's determination to advance the liberation of all captive nations in the interest of our own survival. With your generous support this committee has nurtured this institution so that today Governors and mayors throughout the country are proclaiming the week in behalf of their constituents.

Fortunately, millions of our citizens recognize these essential facts: (1) Since 1959 the one great goal of Soviet Russian cold war maneuvering has been the growing acquiescence of Americans to the permanence of Moscow's vast empire; (2) similar to old imperial Russian techniques, the spurious call for "peaceful coexistence" and the calculated spread of nuclearitis in this country have produced phenomenal success for Moscow as we witness those in high places as well as low seeking an accommodation with this barbaric empire, attempting to play down the captive nations because its truths would irritate Khrushchev, justifying cold war inaction with the false doctrine of mellowism in the U.S.S.R., and on the basis of the empire's present conflicts creating the illusion that we are winning the cold war; and (3) the nationalism reflected in the party rivalries throughout the empire is the prime result of a whole decade of captive nations' opposition to Moscow's imperio-colonial rule, in Poland as well as Georgia, in Rumania as well as Ukraine, in Red China as well as Turkestan.

Nothing would serve Moscow's cold war ambitions more than our neglect of the more than 2 dozen captive nations—the ultimate source of its present empire troubles and also the most strategic instrument in our arsenal of cold war weapons. We are today committing many grave sins of omission in the cold war, for which we shall unquestionably pay heavily later, but beyond all rationality is the thought of allowing the avowed enemy a "breather" to put his empire in order and strengthen it for further thrusts against the free world.

What can we do? This favorite question of timid inactionists, who with nuclearitic fear instantly invoke the robotic Moscow-made answer "it may lead to war," has been answered concretely a hundredfold. The theme of the 1963 week is: "Liberate Cuba—To Restore the Faith in All Captive Nations—To Win the Cold War." Cuba, the latest in the roster of captive nations, can be liberated if we revive the Kersten amendment to the past Mutual Security Act and apply it thoroughly to Cuba.

At this stage of the cold war, when Moscow can ill afford a hot global one, we can also proceed with the following: (1) To expose the last remaining colonial empire, place heavy emphasis on the captive nations by establishing a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations; (2) to put into effect the President's recent suggestion for a reexamination of our views toward the U.S.S.R., open up for public discussion the captivity of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; (3) to advance U.S. cold war education, create the Freedom Commission and Academy; and (4) to focus free world and U.S. understanding on the real nature of the enemy, move for a full-scale debate in the United Nations on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Our failure to at least start with these few proposals would justify raising the question, "Who will be next on the long list of captive nations?"

In appreciation of your contribution to the most impressive week yet and with best wishes.

Sincerely,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman.

PIECEMEAL BIPARTISANSHIP IS UNWORKABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, at periodic, almost predictable intervals, the issue of bipartisanship receives a great deal of attention in the Nation's press. We can all recall the many editorials that appeared during last year's election campaign to the effect that foreign policy should not be an issue. This administration has displayed an almost uncanny ability to appeal to the hallowed bipartisan tradition once an action in the foreign policy field has been completed. This same administration is strangely silent, however, when the negotiations or plans affecting a future action in this field are first initiated.

This is such a period, Mr. Speaker. High level negotiations are slated to begin in Moscow in the very near future. The minority has not been consulted. The minority has not been invited to participate. The minority has not been invited to observe.

Yet, who can doubt that if a test ban agreement is reached, bipartisan support will be persuasively suggested, widely requested and finally, in "the national interest," righteously demanded.

Mr. Speaker, a tradition as sacred as the bipartisan tradition does not die easily, even when abused by one party or the other. It has worked successfully in the past. The sheer momentum of that success has sustained its operation over the last 2 years. But that momentum is faltering. Bipartisanship will die unless the present administration reverses its practice and commits itself to consistent, not piecemeal bipartisanship.

I choose my words carefully. "Piecemeal bipartisanship" means selective bipartisanship. It means bipartisanship dictated by only one party to the so-called agreement. It refers to the existing state of affairs in which the present administration determines when, where, and whether the bipartisan principle will apply. The "when" in present circumstances usually occurs only after negotiations have been completed and the action already taken. Thus, by present definitions formulated by the current Executive, the minority party essentially serves only as a rubber stamp.

In the final analysis, this practice is far worse than the controversial news management policies of the administration. This practice, in effect, involves destiny management. It becomes a case of the Executive arrogating to itself the sole prerogative of determining what our actions should be. This destiny management bypasses the traditional role of the Congress and the American people. It denies them the meaningful voice they once had in the formulation of consensus concerning major foreign policy action.

In Cuba, prior to last October's confrontation, all attempts by the minority to call for a blockade or a quarantine or any other action, were subjected to a massive administration-inspired barrage of warmongering charges. No minority proposal—and there have been many—has been afforded serious consideration by the present directors of our destiny. Yet, when the President finally was forced to act because of the intolerable threat posed by the Russian missiles, there was a loud call for bipartisanship. At that time, an election was only a few short weeks away. Also at that time, many of us in the minority felt the President's action was too little and too late. Nevertheless, in the spirit of the bipartisan tradition, the minority party rallied to the support of the President's action.

This one-sided tolerance on the part of the minority, Mr. Speaker, will not last forever. This hallowed tradition we hear so much about is a two-way street. And it is about time we started traveling in two directions on that street.

Consider the Laotian disaster. That unfortunate country has been written off by the administration. When Laos finally goes completely, all of southeast Asia will most probably follow as a matter of course.

At the time of the Geneva accords on Laos, I addressed an urgent letter to the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. It was answered by the principal architect of the disastrous Laos accords, Averell Harriman. The exchange of correspondence between Mr. Harriman and myself on the subject of the Geneva accords on the neutrality of Laos appears on pages 6376 to 6379 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this year.

For all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, the grave misgivings expressed in my correspondence and the equally grave misgivings expressed by large numbers of my colleagues in the Congress were ignored. The usual answer a member of the minority hears when he expresses misgivings about foreign policy actions is that we must unite behind the President in a spirit of bipartisanship.

This commitment to a piecemeal bipartisanship on the part of the present administration is unworkable. The minority party cannot fulfill its obligations to the 48 percent of the American electorate it represents by conceding to the Executive the right to exercise a discriminatory, selective bipartisanship whenever it is deemed necessary or desirable.

The minority party's good will and docile tolerance of such practices is not inexhaustible, Mr. Speaker. A display of good will and good faith is necessary on

both sides of a cooperative relationship. Such a display has been sorely lacking in recent years.

Was the minority consulted, for example, prior to the decision to withdraw our Thor and Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey? The minority was not.

Was the minority consulted prior to our decision to scrap Skybolt or to establish a multinational nuclear force? The minority was not.

Was the advice or concurrence of the minority sought before the United States decided passively to accept the recognition of the Kadar regime's credentials by the United Nations? It was not.

Was the advice or concurrence of the minority sought before President Kennedy announced at American University on June 10 a test moratorium on atmospheric testing? Predictably, no.

Was the minority informed of the administration's plans to hold high level talks in Moscow for the purpose of negotiating a test ban? Was the minority invited to participate in these talks? Was the minority extended the courtesy of sending an observer to these talks? In every case, the answer is no. In too many other cases as well, the answer would also be no.

Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman and Deputy Director of the Arms Control Agency, Adrian Fisher, have been chosen by the President to represent the United States in the upcoming test-ban talks in Moscow. These men certainly are not the best negotiators the United States could have chosen. Mr. Harriman is the principal architect of our disastrous Laotian policy. In effect, he negotiated away that southeast Asian country.

Yet, can the President sincerely expect the minority party, having consistently ignored its counsels, having repeatedly rebuffed its advice, and having continually refused it a role, either as participant or observer in these major decisions—can the President sincerely expect that the minority will continue to display bipartisan support when it has been denied bipartisan participation? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

If the President and the majority party are sincerely interested in obtaining bipartisan support for a test ban agreement and for future U.S. action in other areas of foreign policy, let the administration demonstrate its good faith. Let it begin now to couple its demand for bipartisan support with equally impassioned attempts to provide bipartisan participation in the early stages of major actions.

For the forthcoming test ban negotiations in Moscow, let any treaty or agreement come under bipartisan sponsorship. A member of the minority should be invited by the administration to participate—or at least to serve as an observer—at these discussions. Continued abuse of the bipartisan tradition by this administration can only result in the final and irrevocable breakdown of that tradition.

It is my hope that the administration will cease placing obstacles in the way of the true exercise of bipartisanship by permitting the minority to participate in discussion as well as in final support.

The upcoming test ban negotiations in Moscow would be a good place for the administration to demonstrate its good faith in the true concept of bipartisanship. It is my sincere hope it will do so.

It is my suggestion that the ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, who is also the chairman of a special subcommittee on nuclear testing appointed by Representative GERALD FORD, chairman of the Republican conference, be appointed by the President to serve as a minority observer at these most important discussions in Moscow.

OUR "FRIEND" GREAT BRITAIN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the saying "Save me from my friends." Today the United States could say this about our "friend" Great Britain.

The State Department has announced that protest has been made to Britain that the British Isle of Grand Cayman is being used by Cuba as a base to pass agents out of Cuba into Central America, aboard British owned and operated airlines.

It has come to my attention through published reports that vital American automotive parts and other supplies may be reaching Castro's Cuba through the same island in the Caribbean.

These reports say that break linings, batteries, bearings, spark plugs, copper tubing, and other parts are loaded from Florida ports in quantities that would permit total reequipment of all vehicles on Grand Cayman every 15 days, with parts left over.

Grand Cayman is a small island, with a population of a little over 5,000 people located midway between Jamaica and the Cuban Isle of Pines. Reports indicated that shipments manifested for Grand Cayman on tramp steamers are actually shipped into Cuba directly or on smaller boats. The last calendar year figures available for automotive equipment and parts show that in 1961, 61,042 pounds were shipped into Grand Cayman from the port of Tampa, Fla. In 1962 this almost doubled, to 103,089 pounds. And this is just from one Florida port. Auto parts are vital to Castro, as replacements for the equipment in Cuba when he seized power. Most of them must be of American make.

Free world shipping directly to Cuba continues at a high rate. Our "friend" Britain continues to lead the list of free world nations allowing its ships to trade with Communist Cuba.

This week at a hearing conducted by the Armed Forces Investigations Subcommittee of the House it was disclosed that the British have been building fishing trawlers for Russia. As we all know, Russian fishing trawlers have been invading our historical fishing grounds all along our coastline. New England, the Pacific Northwest, and Florida have been particularly aware of these Russian moves. At this same hearing, witnesses admitted that the trawler fleet may well be engaged in other activity prejudicial to the security of the United States.

Now it may be beyond the great influence of our State Department to discourage the British from building trawlers for Russia. It may not be possible for the State Department to ask Britain to stop trading with Castro. We may be thankful, however, that the State Department has asked Britain to please not permit Castro to export agents through Grand Cayman. We may be hopeful that they will look into shipping to and through Grand Cayman.

In almost every case regarding our Cuban difficulties, we end up at the State Department. They are not particularly concerned about the Russian trawlers, even though these are actually operating in our territorial waters. They are unable to stop free world shipping to Cuba. They are unable to get strong OAS action against Cuba, and at the same time unable to get the U.N. to stop giving assistance to Cuba. Last weekend we were greeted with the happy news that State was at last ready to act. But the only action taken seems to be that Cuban funds in this country have been frozen.

Similar action by OAS member nations, however, would be of help, but no word of such action.

Mr. Speaker, the day has come when we must ask our friends and allies in Britain for some cooperation. And we might at the same time hope for more pressing action from our own State Department.

It may be that Britain has just lost interest in this hemisphere. Her possessions here have been decreasing, as have her responsibilities. She gives indication she would like to withdraw further. There is a responsibility, however, to us.

We have stood ready to assist Great Britain anywhere in the world—we should expect no less from her. We are not asking her to go to war, to risk the lives of British subjects or territory. We are asking for cooperation. Cooperation forbidding the use of British possessions to Castro and his agents. Cooperation forbidding British shipping to enemies of the freedom of the republics of this hemisphere.

We have been asking for this cooperation for months—yea, even years. It has not been forthcoming.

Perhaps our State Department has not been voicing the views of the American people clear enough to the foreign office in London. But the British people should be told that the American people are disappointed, and they are growing angry. This feeling will find ways of expressing itself loudly enough to be heard—even in Britain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I assume this is the same Great Britain who now has the

benefit of a moratorium on the payment of its just loan made by this country to Britain? Some $4 billion has been under a moratorium for several years, a moratorium enacted by Congress. Is the treatment that we get for permitting them not to pay their debts, no principal, no interest on several billion dollars of debts? Is this our recompense?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I agree with the gentleman. This seems to be the feeling in Britain, at least as has been expressed in their recent actions, certainly. There does not seem to be an understanding that friendship is a two-way street, but, rather that we must perform all the actions of friendship. However, when we expect some cooperation to keep out communism from this hemisphere we cannot even get Britain to stop sending its ships carrying Soviet goods, oil and other products, into Cuba. We now find they have been allowing agents to pass throughout their possessions to go all over South America spreading subversion and communism. We can go right down the line citing item after item, even to the building of Russian trawlers, which has not been the act of a friendly nation in the interest not only of ourselves but to the hemisphere, and to all nations that profess to uphold freedom.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman upon his persistence in bringing to the attention of the House of Representatives these matters affecting Cuba and affecting this country and matters of other foreign countries in their dealings with Cuba. He has done an excellent job and I compliment him.

I will say to the gentleman that next week in the Committee on Foreign Affairs I certainly intend to offer an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill providing that no aid of any kind be given any nation which in any way gives aid or comfort to the Communist Government of Cuba. I do not know whether this amendment will be adopted in committee, but certainly I will bring it to the House floor, and I am sure if the gentleman does not offer such an amendment on the floor, I will do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am grateful to the gentleman for his comments and for his interest in doing something about the problem. I am particularly pleased with his membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I know it is going to be most helpful and I might say I certainly will support fully any amendment that will cut off giving American aid in any respect to any country which in any way aids Cuba. It was my amendment that was adopted to that effect by this House in the last bill.

I thank the gentleman.

URBAN RENEWAL—A CLOSER LOOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the report made to the Congress by the Comptroller General relative to the Erieview urban renewal project in Cleveland, Ohio, proves again that no further funds should be made available for the urban renewal program until the basic legislation is rewritten. Present law does not include the kinds of specific criteria and standards which can obviate the abominable administration now rampant from coast to coast. I believe that a complete investigation will reveal that in three-fourths of the projects nationally, the job which is done is not in accordance with the plan which originally justified the expenditures. I believe a full investigation will reveal irregularities, mismanagement, waste, and wrongdoing which constitutes scandal of the first magnitude.

The shortcomings in the Cleveland Erieview project are pointed up by the Comptroller's report.

The full report of the Comptroller should be studied with care. All over the Nation, sound structures within project areas have been declared substandard because a portion of the building has no rear exit or because the building does not have a fire sprinkler system. If no other excuses can be found for the demolition of structures, the administrators simply say the building is facing the wrong way or its style is incompatible.

This incompatibility claim, occasionally justified, becomes almost ludicrous. Any casual tourist who visits Southwest Washington's urban renewal project has the opportunity to view the urban renewal-type incompatibility—the three-story concrete quonset hut dwellings next to the high-rise glass houses, which look out on the asphalt roof and air-conditioning vents of the shopping center below, next to the low-rise public housing. But then, this incompatibility is new incompatibility. Using present criteria, we could probably justify a new urban renewal project in Southwest Washington to remove the new incompatible buildings.

I have today introduced a bill to prevent in the Nation's Capital the kind of meaningless destruction which took place in Cleveland, Ohio, in the Erieview Urban Renewal Project I. My bill incorporates a number of the recommendations made by the Comptroller General of the United States in his report on the Erieview project. In addition, I will shortly take other steps looking toward a complete investigation of urban renewal from coast to coast.

In the covering letter to his Cleveland report the Comptroller General said:

> The Urban Renewal Administration approved Federal grants of over $10 million and Federal loans of over $33 million for large-scale demolition in project I—Erieview, without making an adequate examination of the structural condition of the buildings in the project area to verify that the extent of clearance proposed by the city of Cleveland was warranted.
>
> The Urban Renewal Administration's approval of the project was based on building inspection reports, submitted by the city to the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Chicago regional office, which classified 84, or about 71 percent, of the 118 existing buildings in the project area as substandard because of what the city considered to be serious building deficiencies. The Agency's records indicate that regional office personnel did not inspect the interiors of the buildings in the project prior to the time the Urban Renewal Administration authorized Federal assistance for the project.
>
> Our review showed that only 24, or about 20 percent, of the buildings in the project were substandard because of building deficiencies which could not be corrected by normal maintenance. The cited deficiencies of the other 60 buildings were minor in nature and could be corrected through normal maintenance; these buildings, therefore, did not seem to be "substandard requiring clearance," pursuant to the Urban Renewal Administration's eligibility standards for clearance. Inasmuch as (1) a relatively small percentage of the buildings were structurally substandard, (2) demolition is generally the most expensive form of urban renewal treatment, and (3) the intent of the urban renewal legislation is to encourage alternative forms of urban renewal treatment, such as rehabilitation and spot clearance, we believe that, before approval, the Urban Renewal Administration should have fully investigated the situation to determine whether the extent of demolition proposed by the city was warranted.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. LAIRD, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PELLY, for 30 minutes, on Monday, July 15.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 90 minutes, on July 16, and to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 2 hours on Monday, July 15, on the subject of the fifth observance of Captive Nations Week.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POOL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. GROVER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SENNER.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; and

H.R. 6681. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1745. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 40. An act to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; and

H.R. 6681. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 15, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1028. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the delay by the District of Columbia government in the development and implementation of a medical assistance for the aged program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1029. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix and collect rents for the occupancy of space in, on, under, or over the streets of the District of Columbia, to authorize the closing of unused or unsafe vaults under said streets and the correction of dangerous conditions of vaults in or vault openings on public space, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1030. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1031. A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a special report on American studies abroad by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 432. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5171, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 433 Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 4897. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code: without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6138. A bill to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means; with amendment (Rept. No. 549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 7195. A bill to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid Highway Systems; without amendment (Rept. No. 550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 551). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7019. A bill to provide further compensation to Mrs. Johnson Bradley for certain land and improvements in the village of Odanah, Wis., taken by the Federal Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1532. A bill for the relief of Herbert R. Schaff; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Siegel; with amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2790. A bill for the relief of Owen L. Green; with amendment (Rept. No. 544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4145. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden; with amendment (Rept. No. 546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5822. A bill for the relief of Theodore Zissu; without amendment (Rept. No. 547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6377. A bill for the relief of Sp5. Curtis Melton, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7492. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7493. A bill to extend the time limitation for filing claims under the provisions of the War Claims Act Amendments of 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 7494. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7495. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7496. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 7497. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 7498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the definition of artificial lures, baits, and flies which are subject to the manufacturers excise tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee to convey 0.25 acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 7500. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 7501. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 7502. A bill to eliminate from applications for Federal employment any requirement that arrests in connection with peaceful demonstrations for civil rights purposes shall be reported therein; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7503. A bill to amend section 1245 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to limit application of that section in the case of the sale of an entire business or farm; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 7504. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 7505. A bill to authorize the disposal without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 7506. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of the Federal Tax Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7507. A bill to prohibit discrimination in apprenticeship and other training programs because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7508. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish jurisdiction and venue for appeals from orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission in judicial reference cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 7509. A bill to establish an Office of Community Affairs in the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7510. A bill to extend the postage rates on library materials to films under 16 millimeters in size and film catalogs thereof; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the taxpayer a deduction from gross income for medical, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7512. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fire Island National Seashore, in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7513. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7514. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7515. A bill to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights to include investigations of vote frauds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7516. A bill to provide tax equity by the taxation of cooperative corporations with respect to earnings derived from business done for the United States or any of its agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7517. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7518. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, to restrict the application of that act to arms control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7519. A bill to incorporate the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 7520. A bill to transfer to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia certain powers and duties relating to urban renewal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 7521. A bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7522. A bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7523. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7524. A bill to amend section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide that production of or obtaining weapons for aggression shall result in discontinuance of any assistance from the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 7525. A bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7526. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to increase the authorization for appropriations under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7527. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7528. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits, to reduce in certain cases the age which an individual must attain to qualify for spouse's benefits, to reduce retirement age (with full benefits for both men and women) to 60, to reduce the outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7529. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7530. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1962 relating to Lynnhaven Inlet, Bay, and connecting waters, Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 7531. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution congratulating the American Veterinary Medical Association on its centennial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution relating to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H. Con. Res. 196. Concurrent resolution establishing a Commission on Congressional Identification; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H. Res. 434. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 435. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 7532. A bill for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7533. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7534. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Geraci, his wife, Antonietta Geraci, and their four minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 7535. A bill for the relief of Theodosios N. Kogionis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 7536. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sara Farber Caponigro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 7537. A bill for the relief of Myung Sook Yun Pak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7538. A bill for the relief of Mariano Cabanilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

195. The SPEAKER presented a petition of R. F. Nichols, and others, Political Action Committee, Veterans of World War I, National Headquarters, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their proposal of a plan for the awarding of a pension of at least $100 a month to the veterans of World War I, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.